A

FULL and PARTICULAR

REPLY

TO

Mr. CHANDLER's *Case of Subscription to Explanatory Articles of Faith*, &c.

In Defence of a Book, intitled,

The Church of England *vindicated in requiring Subscription from the Clergy*, &c.

With an Examination

Of the SPEECH of the Reverend *John Alphonso Turretine*, previous to the Abolition of Subscriptions at *Geneva*, translated by Mr. CHANDLER from a *French* MS.

AND

Of Mr. CHANDLER's Reasoning and Observations upon it.

By *JOSEPH CLARKE*, M. A.
Late Fellow of MAGDALEN College in CAMBRIDGE.

——Ignoras te, an ut ignotum dare nobis
Verba putas? ——
—— at tibi contra
Evenit, inquirant vitia ut tua rursus et illi.
HOR.

LONDON.
Printed for W. INNYS in *Pater-noster-Row*.
MDCCXLIX.

BRITISH MUSEUM

A

FULL and PARTICULAR

REPLY,

To Mr. CHANDLER's *Caſe of Subſcription*, &c.

THERE is, I think, no occaſion for an apology, for not having ſooner replied to Mr. *Chandler's Caſe of Subſcription*, with which he obliged the world laſt ſummer; in anſwer to my *Vindication of the Church of England, in requiring Subſcription from the Clergy*, publiſhed near ten years paſt: But if any were neceſſary, the truth is, it was not without reluctance that I have prevailed with myſelf at laſt, to take any notice of that performance: For, whatever opinion *he*, or his *friends* may have of it, I was in no pain to truſt the controverſy, as it ſtood, with the judicious and impartial; who, I did not doubt, would eaſily diſtinguiſh between *argument* and *cavil*, between *reaſoning* and *declaiming*. But, as the *ſtile and manner*, in which he has thought proper to attack me, may require ſome notice; and as the *high accuſations* he has brought againſt me are ſuch, as may perhaps make ſome impreſſion on thoſe who may not have examined into theſe matters; I thought it might not, *on theſe accounts*, be wholly

unneceſſary to give him a reply. Mr. *Chandler*'s *Caſe of Subſcription* contains an anſwer to Mr. *White*, as well as to me; whom he is pleaſed to ſtile *Fellow-Labourers*; which, though intended for a ſneer, I eſteem as a complement—The abilities of the learned Author of the *Letters to a diſſenting gentleman* are ſufficiently known, and he has anſwer'd for himſelf. My part remains.

He acquaints us in his *Preface*, that, "after "he had finiſhed his reply to Mr. *White*, a "worthy friend put into his hands, *The Church* "*of England vindicated* &c." that he "determin-"ed to conſider it, and on that account was "forced to throw by his firſt papers, and pro-"ſecute his deſign upon a new plan."—— I am ſorry that I ſhould any way have been the occaſion, of Mr. *Chandler*'s giving himſelf ſo much trouble—The fault however was not mine, but his own—The book which has, it ſeems, occaſioned all this, though he chuſes to call it a *late* one in his *Title-Page*, had been publiſhed (as I obſerved before) *near ten years*—'Twas unlucky therefore, that a gentleman of Mr. *Chandler*'s *candor* and *impartiality*, and whoſe thoughts have, without doubt, been often, within ſo long a ſpace of time, employed upon the ſubject of *Subſcription*, ſhould yet never in all that time have looked abroad, or inquired what had been written on the other ſide. —The inconſiderableneſs of the author, or of the book, can be no excuſe; Becauſe Mr. *Chandler* could be acquainted with neither, without examining. Beſides, I think I am now authoriſed to ſay, that, as the book was not wholly unknown, ſo neither does it appear to be wholly contemptible; ſince Mr. *Chandler* has, even after nine years, eſteemed it not below *his* conſideration; and has thought it worth while to *throw by his firſt papers*, and to *proſecute his deſign upon a new plan*,

plan, for that purpoſe—If it was worth his while to anſwer it, when he found it; an impartial inquiry might have induced him to have met with it before: If it was contemptible, why did he anſwer it at all?—'Tis pity at leaſt that ſome of his *worthy friends*, who I ſhould think might poſſibly be acquainted with his *growing labours* againſt Mr. *White*, did not put it into his hands a little ſooner, and ſave him ſo much trouble—His *Fellow-Labourer* the *Old Whig*, I dare ſay, could have given him ſome information—It is come however to his hands at laſt; and now I am to pay, it ſeems, for ſo long an exemption: The *Old Whig* is to riſe at laſt in judgment againſt me, and his quarrel is to be revenged—The great Mr. *Chandler*, who, like another *Entellus*, had hitherto ſat by unconcerned, now riſes in his ſtrength, to demoliſh the *Church-Champion*, as he calls me.—His *firſt papers are thrown by*, and the *Deſign* is *proſecuted upon a new plan*; and, I am to feel the weight of Mr. *Chandler*'s reaſoning—and reſentment. He complains of the ſtile and manner, in which my anſwer to the *Old Whig* was written; to which he may give what name he pleaſes, it was the proper method of treating the perſon I had to deal with—His *Principal*, the *Old Whig*, had, with great *boldneſs* and *inſolence*, abuſed the *Clergy in general*, and the *eſtabliſhed Church*, in a *ſcandalous libel*; and therefore it was right to talk with him in a language he ſeem'd beſt to underſtand—A *Gentleman* has a right to his *proper weapons*—The *Old Whig* was to be ingaged in his own Way—To ſtudy the elegance of ſatyr or addreſs to a *libeller*, would be the ſame impropriety as offering garlands to a *common nuſance*; and the politeſt men ſeldom think it neceſſary to *ſtand upon ceremony*, with a *Porter*, or an *Oyſter Wench*—The treatment which the *Old*

Whig, deſervedly, received from me, as bearing my ſhare in the load of abuſe, ſo plentifully diſcharged upon the whole order; Mr. *Chandler* might, with a better graee, have taken notice of in my Book, if he himſelf had obſerved *more decency* than he has done in *his own*, to one from whom he had received no provocation — except That of a *difference in opinion*; which I find, notwithſtanding his boaſted Charity [a], was alone ſufficient.

THE ſolemn gravity, and air of importance, with which he has exhibited the charges of *abuſing and inſulting the Apoſtles* [b], of *doing the higheſt injury to their character and doctrine* [c], of *groundleſs aſſertions, and giving in a falſe account of Antiquity* [d]— The ſuperciliouſneſs with which he has taken upon him to correct me, for *palpable fallacy* [e], for *talking with great aſſurance* [f], for *wading out of my depth* [g], together with his two ſcraps of Latin, *audacter magis quam parate*, and, *naviget Anticyram* [h], to ſhew (I ſuppoſe) that he could be *well bred* in more languages than one—Theſe are calls upon me to do myſelf juſtice, and to prevent others from being impoſed upon by *Miſreports* and *falſe Charges*, ſupported only with *Confidence* and *Self-ſufficiency*— I ſhall therefore endeavour to ſet theſe matters right with the public, to ſhew Mr. *Chandler*'s arguments *in their true light*, and to *balance accounts* with him.

HE puts off his *Caſe of Subſcription*, as an *Anſwer* to the *Church of England vindicated*. As he *determined to conſider it*, after his worthy friend had put it into his hands, he *determined* likewiſe, I ſuppoſe, to *call* it an anſwer—How far it comes up to

[a] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 41. [b] Ibid. p. 43.
[c] Ibid. p. 75. [d] Ib. p. 86. 126. 141. [e] Ib. p. 43.
[f] Ib. p. 86. [g] Ib. p. 124. [h] Ib. p. 135. 43.

to the title, muſt be left to the judgment of others.

THE things which he has contrived to object to, are,

I.

MY aſſertion, that, " to call the *method* in " which the Church of *England requires ſubſcrip-* " *tion* to her articles—*impoſing ſubſcription to arti-* " *cles of faith*—(as the *Old Whig* had done) con- " tains an inſinuation againſt the Governors of the " Church, which is nothing but *calumny*, and a " *falſe repreſentation of fact*; in order to deceive, " and prejudice an unwary reader."

II.

THE *Scripture-Evidence* which I argued from, in ſupport of the *authority* of Church-Governors to make an *explanatory inquiry*, or, in requiring ſubſcription to *explanatory articles*, from thoſe who are candidates for the *office of Public Teachers*.

III.

THE examples brought, to confirm the opinion of ſuch authority, from the *practice* of *Antiquity*.

IV.

MY reply, to the *Old Whig's* argument againſt ſubſcription to explanatory articles drawn from the *brevity* and *ſimplicity* of the *moſt ancient Creeds*.

V.

MY appeal to the ſenſe and practice of *foreign Proteſtant-Churches*.

THESE

THESE I ſhall conſider in their order, and ſhall give a diſtinct reply, to every thing Mr. *Chandler* has objected, under each of theſe heads.

IT would not be ſtrange, if a piece of this kind, written ſo many years ago, ſhould not be able to bear the ſeverer ſcrutiny of a maturer judgment. Upon a reviſal of it however on this occaſion, I have the ſatisfaction to find the foundations ſtill remain ſound and ſtrong. Mr. *Chandler*'s attempts againſt them, have *done them no harm*; But I have not any *better opinion* of them upon *that account*: For though they are not to be *blown down* by a *mere wind of words*, or the *noiſy harangue of popular declamation*; yet, how they might withſtand the force of *ſolid argument*, and *good reaſoning*, I cannot from hence affirm; it being a tryal, which they *have not yet met with*.

I.

I HAD aſſerted, that, to call the Method in which the Church of *England* requires ſubſcription to her articles, "impoſing ſubſcription to articles "of faith; contains an inſinuation againſt the "Governors of the Church, which is nothing but "calumny, and a falſe repreſentation of fact, in "order to deceive and prejudice an unwary rea-"der[i]"

IN anſwer to this, Mr. *Chandler* lifts up his eyes, and "thanks God, that he is not conſcious "to himſelf of any intention to deceive and preju-"dice any one perſon living[k]."—As to his *intention* or his *conſcience*, I have nothing to do with them; But as to the *fact*, whether he and his *Fellow Labourer* do, or do not *deceive*, in this and other inſtances, will be ſeen before we have done.

I

[i] Church of *England* vindicated, p. 19.
[k] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 20.

I OBSERVED, that in common ſpeech, *impoſing* ſubſcription to *articles of faith*, ſignifies a *neceſſity* laid upon men to *profeſs* their *belief* of theſe articles, whether they *really believe* them or not, againſt their judgment and their conſcience; that the *Old Whig* had ſo repreſented the impoſition of ſubſcription to be; and therefore had *miſrepreſented* the caſe: For, that the Church of *England* does *not* lay any neceſſity upon men to *profeſs* their belief of the articles, *whether* they really believe them or not, againſt their judgment and their conſcience; and that, therefore, to repreſent our Church Governors as *impoſing* ſubſcription in this ſenſe, was *abuſing* them, and *putting a trick* upon the reader [l].—The truth is no more than this, explanatory articles are propoſed to the candidates for the office of Public Teachers; not, that they may ſubſcribe *whether they believe them or not*, but, that they may *diſcover*, by *ſubſcribing* or *not ſubſcribing*, *whether* they *do*, or do *not* believe them.—This is nothing more than a *teſt* of the qualifications of ſuch candidates; and the very nature of a teſt is, not to *impoſe opinions* upon any man, but to *diſcover what their opinions are*; not to lay any *force* upon their *private judgment*, but only to bring their private judgment *to light* [m], as neceſſary to be diſcovered, before it can be known whether they are *qualified* for the offices of *Public Teachers*, for which they offer themſelves; But they are *left at liberty* to *ſubſcribe* or *not* to ſubſcribe, to think and *believe* as they pleaſe, to enjoy their *private judgment* without any cenſure or inconvenience; except That of not being admitted to the office of the miniſtry; which being an office

[l] *Vid.* Church of *England* vind. p. 19——21.

[m] Vid. *Stebbing*'s rational Enquiry, c. 2. or Defence of the firſt head of the Report of the Committee, *&c.* Part 2. Sect. 2. c. IV.

fice of *public teaching*, to demand admiſſion to ſuch office, without the *qualifications* which they, who are to judge of them, think *neceſſary*; is demanding *more* than *a right of private judgment*, more than *chriſtian liberty* requires, or has any *claim* to; it is to demand and claim a right, *publicly to diſſeminate* and *propagate by authority* ſuch *private judgment*, and *opinions*; tho' they ſhould be *oppoſite* and *contrary* to the judgment and opinions of *that very ſociety*, into which they deſire to be *admitted* as *Public Teachers*; a demand this, which carries *greater impoſition* in it, than any complained of.

THIS is a true ſtate of the caſe. Let us now ſee what Mr. *Chandler* has to offer; who ſpends a whole chapter, to prove that *impoſition*, in the bad ſenſe of the word, is practiſed in this caſe, by the *King*, the *Church*, and the *whole Legiſlature* [n].—We ſhall ſee how he ſupports this high charge.—One would almoſt be tempted to imagine, that Mr. *Chandler* and the *Old Whig* were *one and the ſame*; ſince he is not contented to vindicate the *Old Whig's* general principles againſt ſubſcription; but undertakes alſo to maintain and defend that writer's particular aſſertions, though evidently as void of truth, as they are of ſupport.——He affirms roundly, and in ſtronger terms than even the *Old Whig* had done, that the Church of *England* "*doth* lay a *neceſſity* upon men to *ſubſcribe*, and "*ſolemnly profeſs their belief* of theſe articles, *whe*-"*ther* they really believe them or not [o]."——How does he ſupport this aſſertion? Why, "*i. e.* (ſays he) the Church demands the ſubſcrip-"tion from All *who would enter into her miniſtry*, "and without it excludes them [p]."—Really, if this

[n] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 22, 23.
[o] Ibid. p. 24.
[p] Ibid. p. 24.

this be the caſe, that this is to paſs for *reaſoning* and *argument*, I muſt e'en go back to the Univerſity, and learn my logic over again. For, are theſe two Things the ſame?—"To demand ſub-"ſcription *or* exclude from the miniſtry"—and —"To lay a *neceſſity* upon men to *profeſs their* "*belief* of theſe Articles, *whether* they *believe* "them or *not?*" Are they not *at liberty*, whether they *will*, or *will not profeſs* their *belief* of them? Mr. *Chandler* knows they are. How then can he, with any regard to truth, aſſert (as he does) that there is ſimply a *neceſſity* laid upon them, to *profeſs their belief* of them, *whether* they really *believe* them or *not?* Does the *alternative* of not being admitted to the miniſtry upon their *not* profeſſing to *believe* them, prove that they are obliged to *profeſs* their belief of them? No; it ſhews the *direct contrary*, by pointing out the caſe, *upon which only* ſuch profeſſion is *required*; and That only *on ſuppoſition* alſo, that they really *do believe* them.—The quæſtion to be tried under this head is, not whether this alternative be a hardſhip; But whether That proves, that thereby a *neceſſity* is laid upon them, to *profeſs their belief* in the articles, *whether* they *believe* them or *not*; For *this* is what Mr. *Chandler* has ventured to affirm; But the reader ſees, that the explanation by which he endeavours to ſupport it, plainly ſhews that he has aſſerted, what he cannot make good.

Mr. *Chandler* was ſenſible, that in order to prove the method (for of That only we are now diſputing) in which the Church of *England* requires ſubſcription, to be *impoſing* ſubſcription, in any bad ſenſe of the word; it was incumbent upon him to prove, that it was *impoſing*, or *inforcing* an *obligation*, a *ſimple obligation*, to *ſubſcribe*; and therefore he would repreſent the caſe, as if they were obliged, as an *abſolute*, ſimple, indiſpenſable *duty*, to *profeſs* their

 belief

belief of the articles, *whether* they *really believe* them or *not*: Whereas, when he comes to explain, it appears that this profeſſion is not required, but *only upon ſuppoſition* that they *do* believe them; which is plain from the profeſſion being expreſsly required to be *ex animo*; and *upon condition only*, that they *demand admiſſion* to the *office of Public Teachers*; For the *end* and *deſign* of requiring ſuch profeſſion, is only that they may not be ſo admitted, unleſs they *really do believe* them; and when once the demand of admiſſion to that office ceaſes, the requiring ſuch profeſſion ceaſes, and they are left in quiet to enjoy their private opinions.

BUT he will try at it again, though we ſhall find that he is forced at laſt to ſpeak the truth, and ſhew it to be a vain attempt.—He ſays, that "the *eccleſiaſtical* and *civil law* doth enforce, by "very great and ſevere penalties, ſubſcription to "the articles, and declaration of aſſent to the "truth of them: And therefore doth thus far "either *oblige men to believe* them, *in contradiction* "*to their reaſon and judgment*, or to *profeſs their be-*"*lief* of them in the moſt ſolemn manner, *whether* "*they believe or diſbelieve* them. The thing re-"quired *by law* is *preciſely* ſubſcription.[q]" What does he mean by *thus far?* If there be any *conditions*, or *ſuppoſitions*, which he has not here mentioned; then the thing required *by law* is not *preciſely* ſubſcription. If there be *no* ſuppoſitions or conditions in requiring ſubſcription; then he might have ſaid, and ſhould have ſaid, that the *eccleſiaſtical* and *civil law* doth, not *thus far*, but *abſolutely* and *ſimply* require ſuch ſubſcription; and then, and then only, would it be requiring *preciſely* ſubſcription.

To

[q] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 25.

To ſay therefore, that the Church of *England* requires *preciſely* ſubſcription; and yet, in the ſame breath, that it requires it only *thus far*; is an *inconſiſtent account*, and *implies*, that there is *ſomething farther* in the caſe of ſubſcription, which he has not yet mentioned; and ſo indeed there is; and it is ſomething too that will ſhew it *not* to be *preciſely* ſubſcription.—This is what I deny it to be, and Mr. *Chandler* himſelf ſhall deny it preſently.—" The thing, ſays he, required *by* " *law* is *preciſely* ſubſcription and declaration of " aſſent to them. If they believe them, well; if " not, *the language of the law* is, *ſay that you do* " *at leaſt, and ſubſcribe* to it[r]."—If This indeed were all, it would be requiring *preciſely* ſubſcription; But the end of the ſentence undoes all again —" *or elſe* never enter into the miniſtry of the " Church[s]," but (he ſhould have ſaid) enjoy your private judgment unmoleſted, for the Church requires *no* ſubſcription from you.—But now what is become of his *preciſely?*—of *preciſely obliging* men to *believe*, in contradiction to their reaſon and judgment *&c?*—This, you ſee, was the ſecret of his *thus far*; which he had been endeavouring to keep out of the reader's ſight for above a dozen lines together, and was afraid to let him into it 'till the laſt line of the paragraph, becauſe he was conſcious it would ruin all he had been labouring at before. And will Mr. *Chandler* undertake to maintain, what he has here ſo unguardedly ventured to aſſert? *viz.* that if the perſon, to whom the articles are offered, does *not believe* them; yet ſtill " the language of the *law* is, *ſay at leaſt that you do, and ſubſcribe?*—Does not the law, on the contrary, *ſuppoſe* and *expect*, that he *does* believe *before* he ſubſcribes, and require him *not* to ſub-

 ſcribe,

[r] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 25. [s] Ibid.

ſcribe, unleſs he *does* believe?—Is not the *end* and *deſign* of this *teſt* to prevent his being admitted to the office of a Public Teacher, if he does *not* believe the articles? and is it not therefore offered only to *diſcover whether* he *does*, or *does not*; upon *ſuppoſition* and in *expectation*, that he neither *ought* to, nor *will* ſubſcribe, unleſs he really *does* believe them?—To repreſent the *law* therefore, as *not concerning itſelf*, in requiring ſubſcription, whether the perſon *believes* the articles or *not*; that, "if he "believes them, well; if not, that the language of "the law is, ſay at leaſt that you do, and ſub-"ſcribe;" *i. e.* that the *language of the law is*, be at leaſt a *knave* and a *hypocrite*—This I ſhall only ſay (though I might be juſtified in ſaying a great deal more) ſhews how far *prejudice* will hurry a man!—Could Mr. *Chandler* poſſibly be *ignorant* here? muſt he not *know*, that to ſuppoſe the *law*, in requiring ſubſcription, is *unconcerned* in regard to the *faith* of the ſubſcriber; or, if he does *not* believe, bids him at leaſt *ſay he does*, and ſubſcribe; muſt not Mr. *Chandler know*, that this is ſuppoſing the law intended to *fruſtrate* it's *own end*, in offering the *teſt*, *viz.* to *diſcover* the *real faith* of the perſon to whom it is offered? which is ſuch an abſurdity, as even Mr. *Chandler* himſelf could not ſuppoſe.——He will do well to conſider, how he can ſo ſolemnly *thank God, that he has no intention to deceive any perſon living*.——I muſt here inſiſt, that this is *directly* calculated to *deceive*: and, if he be not guilty of the *intention*, he is guilty of the *fact*, which is all that I am concerned in—whatever Mr. *Chandler* may be; and I here return him the complement, of *leaving him to his private meditations*[1].

'Tis

[1] Ibid. p. 155.

'Tis in the ſame ſtrain that he acquaints us what it is, that "he calls *impoſing* the articles." Men "are laid (he ſays) *by law* under an *abſolute* "*neceſſity* to *declare* publickly and ſolemnly their "*belief* of them, and *forced* to ſubſcribe them, "with a declaration that 'tis *willingly and ex ani-* "*mo*, under very ſevere penalties; thoſe of ex- "cluſion from the miniſtry[u]." It would not be eaſy for an ordinary Genius, to put together ſo much contradiction in the compaſs of five lines: But Mr. *Chandler* can do any thing. — He tells you, that you are under an *abſolute neceſſity* of ſubſcribing—and pray what is this *abſolute Neceſſity?* Why, an *abſolute neceſſity*, of ſubſcribing *or* not being admitted to the office of the miniſtry, *i. e.* an *abſolute neceſſity* of ſubſcribing, *or not* ſubſcribing; an *abſolute neceſſity* of a *conditional Subſcription*; an *abſolute neceſſity impoſed* upon you of doing—what? why, *what you like beſt*; what you may either *do*, or *let it alone*—And thus ſubſcription is moſt wonderfully proved to be an *impoſition*.

In the next place he tells you, that you are *forced* to ſubſcribe; and yet he owns, that it is expected to be done *willingly and ex animo* — So that the Church of *England* again, *forces* a man to do—no more than he is *heartily willing* to do; and thus again is guilty of *impoſition*—And if the Church of *England* was to uſe the *ſame force* to make Mr. *Chandler* a Biſhop; ſhe would, I ſuppoſe, *impoſe* it upon him; and therefore, if any *ſuch impoſition* ſhould ever be attempted, we may expect to hear of a *nolo-epiſcopari* in good earneſt.

But if you do not ſubſcribe (ſays Mr. *Chandler*) you are not only excluded from the *miniſtry*, but "from all the *advantages* and *emoluments* at- "tending it."[x] — I thought indeed where the *impoſition* lay. But yet Mr. *Chandler* will not be able

[u] Ibid. p. 25. [x] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 25.

able to prove a jot more of *impoſition* in it, than there was before — We are talking of an impoſition indeed; but an impoſition upon *what?*—— Is it not of an impoſition upon *conſcience?* Has not this been the great, and chief plea of the *Diſſenters*; at leaſt the only one that is *decent* for them ſo ſtrenuouſly to inſiſt upon? — But Mr. *Chandler* ſpeaks out, and the true reaſon why it is called an *impoſition* is, it ſeems at laſt, becauſe you muſt either ſubſcribe, or loſe the *Church-Preferments.*—But what have theſe to do in the quæſtion? — Do Mr. *Chandler* and his *Fellow-labourers* think themſelves *obliged in conſcience* to be *Archbiſhops*, and to procure for themſelves *emoluments* and *Church-Preferments?* — I muſt inſiſt upon it, that theſe things are foreign to the point in quæſtion—He may call it an *inconvenience*, or a *misfortune*, that theſe *emoluments* and *preferments* are not to be obtained by them conſiſtent with their conſcience; But I can find out no *impoſition* here. *Church-Preferments and emoluments*, are what neither Mr. *Chandler* nor I have any *right* or *claim* to; though 'tis not unlikely but in the end he may chance to get more of them. They are only *accidental appendages* to the miniſtry, and entirely *extrinſic* and *foreign.* They are annexed to it only by the *free will of the Eſtabliſhment*; and ſurely they may be annexed to it upon *their own terms* and conditions. Therefore, theſe preferments and emoluments, not being things which men are *obliged in conſcience* to obtain; and there being no *right* or *claim* to them but under *ſuch conditions* as the Eſtabliſhment had a *right* of annexing to them; *ſuch conditions* can never be properly called *impoſitions*—To ſay that Church-Preferments and emoluments are the *common rights*, or the *natural rights* of Chriſtians, is begging the quæſtion; and, if Mr. *Chandler* goes upon this foun-

foundation, I muſt call upon him to prove it; 'till he has done which, I am at liberty to aſſert, that no man has *any right* whatſoever to theſe *emoluments* in any Church, unleſs *qualified* by *ſubmitting to the terms* upon which that Church, and the Legiſlature, have annexed them, and had a *right* to annex them, to the office of Publick Teachers.

WHATEVER may be ſaid of a right merely to be admitted as a *Public Teacher* (which is not the quæſtion in this place) certainly, the *emoluments* which the Eſtabliſhment has annex'd to that office, no man can have a natural *right* to, but upon *their* terms; and therefore, to call it an *impoſition*, that the Eſtabliſhment will not confer thoſe emoluments upon *any* terms *theſe gentlemen pleaſe*, is a *demand* as bold as it is unreaſonable.

BUT to return to Mr. *Chandler*'s *preciſe Subſcription*. He is obliged at laſt to confeſs the truth. — "'Tis true, ſays he," ('*Tis true* indeed, but 'tis hard to come out) "if they who offer themſelves "for admiſſion into the Church, as Publick Teach-"ers, or who being Publick Teachers would ac-"cept of ſome new preferment in it, do not be-"lieve the articles, *they are ſtill at liberty to let* "*it alone*. They are *not obliged* to *believe*, or *act* "*otherwiſe* than as their *conſcience* directs them, "*&c.*"[y] — Is it ſo? Why then did he ſay that *the thing required was preciſely ſubſcription?* and that the Church of England *obliges men to believe the Articles, in contradiction to their reaſon and judgment*, and *enforces them to profeſs their belief of them, whether they believe or disbelieve them?* — "And "ſo it ſeems (ſays he) there is no *impoſition* in "this caſe, becauſe you are *left to your liberty*, "either to believe and ſubſcribe, and enjoy the "emoluments of the Church, or not to believe "and

[y] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 25, 26.

"and ſubſcribe." — undoubtedly none: But he adds, "and thereby be rendered incapable of "thoſe *emoluments.*"[2] — Aye, *there* is the *impoſition*—But, as men are ſtill left to act *as their judgment and conſcience direct* them, there is no impoſition upon *conſcience*, no impoſition upon *Chriſtian liberty*; which has been the great pretence to *lead up the cry* with, againſt ſubſcription. The acknowledgment, however, that *Church-Preferments* and *emoluments*, are not what theſe gentlemen have *no views* or deſigns upon, in raiſing this diſturbance about ſubſcription, is ingenuous, and we are obliged to Mr. *Chandler* for it; and it may ſerve to open the eyes of others, who may hitherto have been deceived, under a notion that *conſcience* only is the Motive and Plea, upon which the *great outcry* has been raiſed againſt the Church of *England*.

LET us look back a little upon this gentleman's reaſoning, and apply it to the caſe of *State-oaths*; and try if that will not ſhew him the abſurdity of it.

THE *law* requires, that before any man can enjoy any *places of power or truſt*, any *State-emoluments* and *preferments*, he muſt take the *abjuration-oath*. Now, tho' Mr. *Chandler* and I, can very ſafely take *this oath*, yet there are many who *cannot*; and may they not, with equal truth, argue as Mr. *Chandler* does; that this is *impoſing* an oath upon them, and *enforcing* a declaration of unfeigned aſſent to the truth of this oath; and, either *obliging* men to *believe*, in *contradiction to their judgment and conſcience*; or to *profeſs their belief* in the moſt ſolemn manner, whether they *believe* or *disbelieve?* The *thing required by law*, is *preciſely* the oath, and declaration of aſſent to the doctrine

[2] Ibid. p. 26.

doctrine of it. *If they believe it, well; if not, the language of the law is, ſay that you do at leaſt*; or elſe never expect any *ſtate-emoluments* or *preferments*; or depart out of them *into beggary and jails*. 'Tis true, if they who offer themſelves for admiſſion into State-offices, do *not believe* the doctrine of the *abjuration-oath*, they are *ſtill at liberty* to *let it alone*; they are *not obliged* to *believe*, or act otherwiſe than as their *conſcience* directs them; that is, they may refuſe to do what the *law* requires them; and ſo bring themſelves under the incapacities and penalties that the *law* ordains, in caſe of non-compliance. *Candidly ſaid, This! and ſo, it ſeems, there is no impoſition* in this caſe; becauſe you are *left to your liberty*, either to believe and ſubſcribe, and enjoy the *emoluments* of the State; or not to believe and ſubſcribe, and thereby be rendered incapable of thoſe *emoluments*; and, as the caſe may happen, *to ſtarve* or *go to jail* *. — This is Mr. *Chandler*'s way of reaſoning. I have uſed his own words, only applying them to *State-oaths*, inſtead of *ſubſcription to explanatory articles*; and if it be good againſt the one, I will undertake to prove it equally ſo againſt the other.

But will Mr. *Chandler* ſay, that what the *State* here requires, is *preciſely* the oath, and *obliging* men to *profeſs their belief* in it, *whether* they *really* believe it or not? and yet there is the very ſame reaſon to ſay it of the *oath*, that there is to ſay it of *ſubſcription*: But the truth is, there is no reaſon to ſay it of *either*; both of them being required only *upon ſuppoſition* of *entering into offices of truſt*, and receiving the *emoluments* annexed to them — *Neither* of them therefore are *preciſely required*; but, in both caſes, men are *left at liberty* to enjoy their *private judgment*, without any *impoſition* upon them,

* *Vid.* Caſe of Subſcription, p. 25, 26.

them, either of the *oath* in one caſe, or of *ſubſcription* in the other.

AGAIN—Will Mr. *Chandler* ſay, that the *State* is *guilty of an impoſition*, becauſe it does not permit men to enjoy its *public offices and places of truſt*, with the *emoluments* attending them, but upon compliance with the *terms* the *State* has injoined? And yet he muſt ſay this, if he will ſtand by his reaſoning in regard to *ſubſcription*. But the truth is as before; it is an impoſition in *neither* caſe—The diſtribution of theſe emoluments, depending in both caſes upon the *free will* of the *Legiſlature*, it has undoubtedly a right to annex them in ſuch form and meaſure, and *upon ſuch terms* and conditions, as appear to be for the *public good* and benefit of *each Body*, the *Church* and the *State*.

I VERY well know what will be ſaid to all this, *viz.* that the State *has* authority to require *ſtate-oaths*; But has *not* authority to require *ſubſcription* to *explanatory articles*; that it *has* a right to diſtribute its *emoluments* upon condition only of *ſuch oaths*; But has *no* right to withold them upon account of *non-ſubſcription*, i. e. the *State* and the *Church* ſhall *have* authority, *where theſe gentlemen pleaſe*; and where *they* do *not* pleaſe, neither of them ſhall *have any*. But what! Hath not the *State* an *equal right* to withold its *rewards* and *emoluments*, or to give them under *its own terms*, in *one caſe* as well as the *other*? — Internal qualifications and capacities, natural rights, *&c.* have nothing to do here, nor give any *claim*, excluſive of the external *terms*, more in one caſe than in another. — Where then is the difference? Will Mr. *Chandler* undertake to prove, that any man has more *natural right* or *claim* to the *emoluments* of a *Biſhoprick*, than he has to thoſe of an *Exciſe-man*, but *upon the terms* of the *Legiſlature*? and yet, he may at the ſame time be *equally qualified*

for

for both.—The witholding *emoluments* and *preferments* therefore, it is evident Mr. *Chandler* may as well complain againſt in one caſe, as the other; nor will all his art be able to ſhew any difference. As to the other part of the anſwer, concerning the *Authority* of *requiring Subſcription* to *explanatory articles*; That will be the proper point to be examined under the next head.——In the mean time, I muſt beg leave to have a little regard to *order*, and *diſtinction* of *quæſtions*.

The quæſtion, in *this place*, between Mr. *Chandler* and me is, not whether the Legiſlature hath authority to require ſubſcription to *explanatory articles*, as explanatory; or *any* ſubſcription to *any articles* at all; *That* (as I obſerved) is the buſineſs of the next inquiry: But the quæſtion to which the debate is *here* confined, is, whether the *method* or *manner* (for of That only we are now ſpeaking) *in which* ſubſcription is required, be properly, and in the bad ſenſe of the word, an *impoſition*. For this is what I denied, and what the *Old Whig* and Mr. *Chandler* aſſert. This is what the latter has here attempted to prove;

First, by affirming, that what is required is *preciſely* ſubſcription; and that an *obligation* is laid upon men to *profeſs their belief* of the articles (be they, or be they not explanatory) whether they *really believe* them or *not*, againſt their *judgment* and their *conſcience*. This he has failed in the proof of; it appearing, that ſubſcription is not what is *preciſely* required, but required *only upon ſuppoſition*, and *as a condition only*, of being *admitted to the office of Public Teachers*, merely as a *teſt* of their *qualification*; required only upon a *demand of being admitted* to that office, *ceaſing* with *that demand*, and *always leaving men at liberty* to ſubſcribe or *not* ſubſcribe; and to enjoy *unmoleſted their right of private judgment*. And here

the reader is desired to observe, that Mr. *Chandler* allows my definition of imposition, in this case, to be right, *viz.* a necessity laid upon men to profess their belief of the articles, whether they really believe them or not, against their judgment and their conscience: For his argument procedes upon it; and he endeavours to prove the requiring subscription to be an imposition, on this account, that what the law requires is precisely subscription; and that it lays a necessity upon men to subscribe, and solemnly profess their belief of the articles, whether they really believe them or not; that tho' they do not believe, yet the language of the law still is, say you do at least, and subscribe——And therefore, since he has failed in proving the truth of these assertions, which was what he undertook to prove, as necessary to justify the calling it an imposition in a bad sense, and in the sense I denied it so to be; he has failed in proving against me, and my charge of calumny stands unanswered.

SECONDLY, he has attempted to prove it an *imposition*, by affirming it to be such on account of its excluding men from the enjoyment of *Church-Preferments* and *emoluments*: But this also he has failed in proving; as it appears that *Church Preferments* and *emoluments* are what none are *in conscience obliged* to enjoy; and to which, being mere *extrinsic appendages* to the office, and annex'd to it by the *free will* of the *Legislature*, none can have any *right* or *claim*, but *under the terms* which the Legislature has appointed; and consequently, can have no reason to complain of any *imposition*, if they are not admitted to enjoy *them* upon *what terms they themselves please*.

MR. *Chandler* is pleased to talk of *severe penalties*, *imprisonments* and *jails*[b].——But, lest the reader

[b] Case of Subscription, p. 25, 26.

reader ſhould here again be *deceived* (tho' Mr. *Chandler*, perhaps, may here again *thank God* that he had no ſuch *intention*) and look upon the Church of *England* as an *Inquiſition*, and thus *perſecuting* men for non-compliance with ſubſcription, or for *not profeſſing* their *belief* of the articles *whether* they *believe* them or *not*; as many an unwary reader may be apt to do, from Mr. *Chandler*'s repreſentation — to prevent this, the reader is to know, that theſe ſevere penalties are not in the leaſt incurred, by any *refuſal to ſubſcribe* the articles; but only by *exerciſing the office of Public Teachers* in the Church, *without having given this teſt* of their *qualification*; And this, *not* on account of their *not believing* as the *Church believes*; their faith, their opinions, their *private judgment* are no way concerned in, or *affected* by them; but, for preſuming to take upon them the *public office* of *teaching*, and *propagating what doctrines they pleaſe*, in *defiance* of the *authority* of *Church and State*, in *contempt of the law*, without any regard to the *qualification* and *terms* preſcribed thereby. A *law*, without ſufficient *ſanctions* to ſupport it, is the ſame in effect as *no law*; and if the Legiſlature has a power to preſcribe *any terms at all*; it muſt have authority alſo to *enforce* and *ſupport that law* by ſufficient *ſanctions*, by pains and penalties; which, in the preſent caſe, are not inflicted for *non-ſubſcription*, or for *teaching* or *believing* doctrines *different* from the *doctrines of the Church*, on that account, on account of their *being ſo different*; but, for *exerciſing the office of teaching at all*, in *contempt of the authority* of the *Legiſlature*. —— And this will plainly appear to be the caſe, by recollecting only, that theſe *penalties of the law* would be *equally* incurred, by any perſon who ſhould preſume to *exerciſe the office of a Public Teacher* in the Church, *without having ſubmitted to this teſt*,

teſt; though he ſhould *teach no other doctrines*, and *believe no other doctrines*, than what the *Church* herſelf *teaches* and *believes*.

All therefore that Mr. *Chandler* has ſaid in ſupport of this *ſlander*, vented by the *Old Whig*, and *adopted by himſelf*, has not been ſufficient to prove the Legiſlature guilty of any *unwarrantable impoſition*, in the *method* of requiring ſubſcription to the xxxix Articles; and therefore I ſhall venture to repeat the charge of *calumny* and *miſrepreſentation of fact*, and leave them to get clear of it, *if they can*. And here I might diſmiſs Mr. *Chandler*'s chapter of *impoſition*, truly ſo called. But as there is ſomething which he calls me to account for, in *eaſe of ſubſcription*, p. 149. which may more properly be taken notice of in this place; I ſhall therefore ſpeak to it before I proceed.—"It may be farther obſerved, (ſays he) as "an inſtance of the *peculiar rigour* of the diſci-"pline of the eſtabliſhed Church, in exacting "ſubſcriptions, that though the Author of the "Church of *England* vindicated takes on him *po-"ſitively* to affirm, that *none but the Clergy are re-"quired to give this teſt of their religious opinions*, "yet that the *fact* is againſt him, and that he did "*not know*, or hath *wilfully concealed* the truth. "For All without exception that are *matriculated* "into the *Univerſity*, are obliged, if ſixteen years "of age, to ſubſcribe to the articles of faith and "religion, *&c.*"—To which formidable charge, I reply;—that what I ſaid, p. 22. in regard to the *Clergy* only being obliged to ſubſcribe; I ſufficiently *explained*, p. 27. by my quotation from Dr. *Coneybeare*'s *Sermon*: For, ſpeaking there, *profeſſedly*, of the *different obligations* of *Clergy* and *Laity*; and having ſaid that the *Laity* were required to profeſs their belief of the fundamental articles of

our

our faith, in *Baptiſm*, and in the *daily Offices* of the Church; I *reſtrain* This, by adding—*ordinarily this is all.*—To ſay that *ordinarily*, or *commonly*, or *for the moſt part*, this is all required of the *Laity*; is ſo far from *concealing the truth*, that it is *allowing*, and *ſuppoſing*, that this was not ſo *always*, *abſolutely*, and *without exception*; and therefore did not *exclude* the *cuſtom of the Univerſities*. I had no occaſion to be ſo particular in p. 22. nay nor even in p. 27. ſince, in both places, my *only buſineſs* was to ſhew, upon what account the *Clergy* were *peculiarly* required to ſubſcribe the articles, *viz.* as being to exerciſe the *ſtanding office* of *Publik Teachers* (agreeable to the *Title* of my book, which was, a vindication of the Church of *England* in requiring ſubſcription from the *Clergy*) and the *diſtinction* between *them* and the *Laity*, was mention'd, in p. 22, only *incidentally*; and, in p. 27, to ſhew that *more* might *reaſonably be required* from the *Clergy* as *Teachers*, than from *Laymen merely as ſuch*; and that accordingly the *Clergy* were required to *ſubſcribe the articles*, while the *Laity* were required to profeſs their belief of the fundamental articles of our faith, in *Baptiſm*, and the *daily Offices* of the Church; For it was there *expreſsly added*, that this latter was only the caſe *ordinarily*, (which *admits of exceptions*) and, moreover, in ſuch caſes where the *Laity* are *conſidered merely as Chriſtians*.—Theſe were the *reſtrictions* which I *expreſsly added*.—If therefore there be any caſes, where the *Laity* are obliged to *ſubſcribe*, but are not, in thoſe caſes, conſidered *merely as Chriſtians*; this will not be inconſiſtent with any thing I have ſaid.

Now this is the very caſe of the *Univerſities*; where, when *Laymen* are required to *ſubſcribe the articles*, they are *not* conſidered *merely as*

Chriſtians

Chriſtians therein, but as *ſomething more*—It is well known, by All who have had their education at *our Univerſities*, that *Laymen* perform ſeveral *public exerciſes*, wherein matters may be treated of inconſiſtent with the doctrines of the Church of *England*, and her articles — And therefore, in requiring ſubſcription from *them*, they are here not conſidered *merely as Chriſtians*, but as *Public Teachers*; as men who have, or may have an opportunity of *diſſeminating* hereſy or ſchiſm, by their *lectures* and other *public exerciſes*.

How then could Mr. *Chandler* allow himſelf to tell the world, that I affirmed *poſitively*, and *abſolutely*, that *none but* the *Clergy* were required to ſubſcribe?—Was ſaying that the *Laity* were not required *ordinarily* to ſubſcribe, or when conſidered *merely as Chriſtians*—was this affirming *poſitively*, and *abſolutely*, that *none but* the *Clergy* were required to ſubſcribe, when I *expreſsly*, and *in terms admitted*, and *allowed* of *exceptions to the general rule?* Will Mr. *Chandler* deſcend ſo low, as to vindicate himſelf in this *miſrepreſentation* by ſaying, that theſe words were not in the *particular page* he referred to?—What! are my arguments and account of things to be repreſented by *piece-meal?* and not to be taken *together*, and *in the whole?* Is this practice conſiſtent with a *candid inquiry*, a *calm and impartial review*, as he intitles his book? How would Mr. *Chandler* exclaim againſt any of his opponents, who ſhould be catched at ſuch *tricking*, or (to uſe his own language) ſuch *dice-playing* in controverſy? Was it *candid*, or *impartial*, not to *take notice*, nor *let the reader know*, that I had *expreſsly* added *reſtrictions*, and *limitations* to my general aſſertion? Was it a *calm review*, not to view, or look forward to a *very few pages*, where *theſe reſtrictions* would have ſtared him in the face?——

But this is not all I have to ſay. For when, in the page he refers to, I ſaid that *none but the Clergy* were required to ſubſcribe; what *obligation* was I ſpeaking of? not of any *private injunctions*, not of any ſtatutes or *by-laws* of any *private Bodies*, or *Corporations*; But *ſolely* of the *expreſs* obligation of the *Statute of the 13th of Eliz.* and referred to it at the bottom of the page, as *explanatory* of the *reaſon* why the *Clergy*, *expreſsly*, were thereby required to ſubſcribe, *viz.* as being to be admitted to the *ſtanding office* of *Public Teachers*. In anſwer to which, Mr. *Chandler* obſerves, that not only the *Clergy*, but the *Laity* are alſo required to ſubſcribe—required by *what?*—why, by the *ſtatutes of the Univerſities*; and *therefore*—what?—*therefore* I either did *not know*, or *wilfully concealed the truth*, that the *Laity* were required to ſubſcribe by the *ſtatutes of the Univerſities?*—why?—Becauſe I was obſerving upon the *expreſs* obligation *only* of the *Statute of Queen Elizabeth*—This is a ſort of reaſoning, I own I have not been uſed to—The reader ſees, that tho' I *did* add *reſtrictions* as to the *fact*, and *cuſtom upon the ſtatute*; yet I had really *no neceſſity* to have done it at all; Becauſe my buſineſs was only to vindicate the *Legiſlature*, in requiring ſubſcription from the *Clergy* by the *ſtatute of Eliz.* not any *private corporation*, in requiring ſubſcription from the *Laity*, by the ſtatutes, and *by-laws* of the ſociety.—Since Mr. *Chandler* could not but *know* theſe things, it is his buſineſs to ſhew cauſe why ſentence ſhould not paſs againſt him, of *wilfully concealing the truth*. But I ſhall add, as I have this call, that the *Univerſities*, I humbly conceive, in this practice do nothing inconſiſtent with, or contradictory to the *Statute of Eliz.* but act upon the *grounds* and *reaſons* of it; and, if not by the *letter*, yet are juſtified by the *ſpirit* of it. The *reaſon* why the *Statute* requires ſubſcription from the *Clergy*, is,

 becauſe

becauſe they are *Public Teachers*; Therefore, when, in any Society or Body-Corporate, *Laymen* become *Public Teachers* as well as the *Clergy* (which is the caſe in the *Univerſities*) the *ſame reaſon* of the *Statute of Eliz.* holds good, for requiring ſubſcription from the *Laity* in ſuch caſes: And the only quæſtion will be, whether the *Univerſities* have not, by their *Charter*, authority to injoin ſubſcription in ſuch caſes, by their *by-laws* and *ſtatutes*; provided it be not *inconſiſtent with*, or *contrary to* the *laws of the land*; much more, when they injoin nothing but what is *in conformity* to the *ſpirit* of *thoſe laws*, and *founded in the reaſons* of them; and farther, nothing but what is *conſonant*, and *in obedience to*, and *in conſequence of* the *King's Declaration*, *prefixed to the articles*, as *ſupreme Governor of the Church* in theſe Dominions; whereby he *prohibits any perſon* in the *Univerſities*, from *affixing any new ſenſe* to them, or *publicly diſputing* about them.—But this is a quæſtion which concerns not me to inquire farther into; having undertaken only to vindicate the *Legiſlature*, and *Church of England*, as ſuch, and ſo far as *they* require ſubſcription by the *Statute of Elizabeth*.

II.

I NOW procede to vindicate my arguments from the *Scripture-Evidence*, which I produced in ſupport of the authority of Church-Governors, in requiring ſubſcription to *explanatory articles*, from thoſe who are candidates for the office of Public Teachers.

THIS chapter, in Mr. *Chandler's* book, carries abſurdity in the very face of it: For the *Title* he has given it, is —— "Subſcription to "*unſcriptural* articles of faith, not founded in "*ſcripture*" — Strange indeed if it ſhould! — By *unſcriptural* articles, he muſt either mean, articles contain-

containing *unſcriptural doctrines*; and then the Title of his chapter is, ſubſcription to *unſcriptural doctrines*, not founded in *Scripture*; and ſo he has employed near fifty pages to prove, that *two and two make four* —— Or, by *unſcriptural* articles, he muſt mean, articles not compoſed in *ſcripture-words*: But did ever any man, before Mr. *Chandler*, call every thing *unſcriptural* that is not in ſcripture-words?—If I ſhould tell him, that he preaches *unſcriptural Sermons* to his audience, becauſe the greateſt part of them (I ſuppoſe) are not exactly in *ſcripture-words*; I might juſtly expect he would think my knowledge in the uſe of language, not to be very extraordinary—But to come to the point.

THE *Principle* I went upon was, that the Apoſtles had given directions, from whence this authority might be rationally deduced.

1. I ARGUED from the *general directions* which we find in ſcripture, to preſerve the doctrines of Chriſtianity, ſo far as in us lies, in their original purity; and to guard the Church of God from being infected by the contagion of error, and falſe doctrines. I mentioned, in particular, that direction of St. *Paul*; to *mark them which cauſe diviſions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which we have learned, and avoid them* [c]; and obſerved upon it, that, "ſince here, *All* are ordered, "Clergy and Laity, to obſerve, ſearch, and in-"quire, in their ſeveral ſtations, into the faith of "*common Chriſtians*; and to *avoid* ſuch of them "who are found to hold *falſe doctrine*; therefore, "*à fortiori*, the *Governors of the Church* are to take "care that none be admitted to the office of *Pub-*"*lic Teachers*, who will *teach* and *propagate* ſuch "doctrine; unleſs they, with whom all men are for-"bidden to *aſſociate*, may nevertheleſs be admitted "to the *higheſt offices* and *honours* of the Church [d]."

[c] Rom. xvi. 17. [d] Church of *England* vindicated, p. 36.

Mr. *Chandler* here begins to ſhew his dexterity at reaſoning.—"An ordinary man (ſays he) would "be apt to conclude, that an advice equally given "to the Laity as the Clergy, equally ſtrongly "concluded both[e]."—Now, before I go any farther, I muſt take the liberty of aſking, of what uſe, or to what end or purpoſe this obſervation was made?—If the advice (to uſe Mr. *Chandler*'s language) *equally ſtrongly* concludes both Clergy and Laity; then, *ex conceſſo*, it takes in the *Clergy*, and is an apoſtolical advice to *them* to avoid, and not admit ſuch perſons, as are there deſcribed, to the office of Public Teachers; which is ſufficient to my argument, whether it might be urged to the Clergy *à fortiori* or not. This therefore is, at beſt, but a mere trifling cavil, ſerving to no one end in the diſpute between us. But, trifling as it is, leſt Mr. *Chandler*'s art of criticiſm ſhould be better thought of than it deſerves; I muſt beg leave to ſay, that his obſervation has this farther misfortune, of not being true.—The advice to *avoid*, concludes with *equal* force both Clergy and Laity: But then it is, when the *avoiding* is conſidered only *in general*, and when Clergy and Laity are conſidered equally as Chriſtians at large. Both Clergy and Laity, conſidered *equally* as *Chriſtians at large*, are *equally* directed to *avoid*, *in general*, thoſe *who cauſe diviſions and offences contrary to the doctrine*; not to aſſociate or communicate with them. Thus far both Clergy and Laity, conſidered *equally* as Chriſtians at large, are *equally* included in the *general* direction: But then, ſuch of the Clergy who are Governors of the Church, having, *moreover*, the office, power, or truſt of admitting to, or rejecting from, the *office of Public Teachers*; and this being a caſe of *greater conſequence* and *importance*, than

[e] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 37.

than merely *aſſociating*, or communicating with; it is ſurely juſt to ſay, that ſuch perſons who are to be *avoided*, *in general*, or not *aſſociated with*, are, *à fortiori*, or with *greater reaſon*, to be prevented from entering into the *office of Public Teachers*; and conſequently, that if All, both Clergy and Laity, conſidered as chriſtians at large, are, by this advice of the Apoſtle, directed to *avoid*, in *general*, or not to *aſſociate* with ſuch perſons; then the Governors of the Church, whoſe office, *moreover* it is, to admit to, or reject from, the *office of Public Teachers*, are, *à fortiori*, directed by the ſame advice, to avoid them in a *peculiar manner*, in their *particular capacity*, in that *more important* caſe, by not admitting them to the *office of Public Teachers*—If a direction were given to the *people of England*, in general, to *avoid*, or not *aſſociate* with men of rebellious principles; would it not be right to conclude, that *that part* of the people, namely the Governors or Legiſlature, were, *à fortiori*, not to admit men of ſuch principles to *offices of power and truſt*? — No, ſays Mr. *Chandler*; an "*ordi-*" *dinary man* would conclude, that the direction, "being *equally given* to the *people* as to the *Go-*" *vernors* or Legiſlature, *equally ſtrongly* concluded both"—The reader will excuſe me endeavouring thus to explain a clear caſe—He ſees the penetration of Mr. *Chandler*'s argumentative genius—The argument requires no *Oedipus* to ſee the force of it; and whatever an *ordinary man* may conclude, I am ſure it muſt be an ordinary, a *very ordinary reaſoner*, who would conclude in the manner Mr. *Chandler* does.

But to give ſome colour to this criticiſm, he inſinuates, by an *i. e.* that the direction to *avoid*, means *expreſsly the ſame* as *not to admit*, ſuch perſons as are abovementioned, to be *Public Teachers*; and that the direction therefore is given equally,

in

in that one ſenſe, both to Clergy and Laity; and ſo, *equally ſtrongly* includes both— Where he met with this comment, I do not think it worth my while to enquire— If, by *not admitting them to be Teachers*, he means, not admitting them *authoritatively* to that office, by *ordaining them to the miniſtry*; I deny that the direction to *avoid* has any ſuch ſenſe, when conſidered as a direction to the *Laity*; and it will be incumbent upon him to prove it—But if, by *not admitting them to be Teachers*, he means, avoiding to *hear* ſuch Teachers; the direction to *avoid* them, will coincide with *not aſſociating* with them; and then, though *equally including*, in that ſenſe, both Clergy and Laity; yet from thence we may argue *à fortiori*, as explained above, to the Governors of the Church, in regard to their not admitting them to the *office of Public Teachers*. So that Mr. *Chandler* obliges me to ſay, that he here ſhews, either that he does not underſtand the *advice*, or that he does not underſtand an *argument*.

But he ſays at laſt, that he "will not diſpute "ſo critical a point with me[f]."——Truly, unleſs he had more to ſay, he might as well not have begun to diſpute it at all; and if he could have ſaid more to the purpoſe, 'tis pity the public ſhould have been deprived of it, by his leaving the learned diſquiſition of ſo critical a point, where *Butler* did the ſtory of his *fiddle and bear*——The point indeed is not a critical, but a very plain one; and would have remained ſo, if Mr. *Chandler* would have let it alone; though he is miſtaken if he imagines that *confuſing* is *criticiſing*; unleſs, as *Midas* had a power of turning every thing he touched into gold, Mr. *Chandler* has a power of turning every thing he touches into a *criticiſm*.

As

[f] Caſe of Subſcript. p. 37.

As to the *condition*, upon which he ſays he *will not diſpute this point* with me, *viz.* "if I will allow "him one thing, which he muſt inſiſt on: which "is, that if Church Governors are obliged by "this command, *à fortiori*, not to admit ſuch "perſons as public miniſters, the Laity are "obliged, by virtue of the ſame command, "*à fortiori*, for their own ſake, to avoid them "if they ſhould[g]"—— This I allow him very readily; and when I have done, ſhall only obſerve, that it is nothing to any one purpoſe of the preſent debate, and ſo I leave him to the enjoyment of it— And thus you ſee at laſt the *importance* of this obſervation of Mr. *Chandler*'s; which he is ſo conſcious of, that he is willing to part with it upon terms, which are not of the leaſt ſervice to him; and thereby juſtifies me in calling it at the end, what I called it at the beginning, *a mere trifling cavil.*

But The Querie I offered upon this apoſtolical direction, which Mr. *Chandler* allows (as I obſerved before) to include the caſe of admitting candidates into the miniſtry, was this. — "If the "Governors of the Church are ἐξετάζειν, to *ſearch*, "and *inquire*, whether they, who offer themſelves "for the offices of Public Teachers, are ſuch "as cauſe, or are likely to cauſe diviſions and "offences, contrary to the doctrine which they "have learned; and if, in order to *diſcover this*, "they muſt *inquire* into their *faith* and religion; "I would willingly be told, how they can per"form this whole matter better, than by requi"ring, before admiſſion, a public declaration of "their faith and religion, drawn up by proper "authority for that purpoſe[h]" — This was the quæſtion

[g] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 37.

[h] Church of *England* vind. p. 37.

quæſtion I aſked the *Old Whig*, for whom Mr. *Chandler* " *willingly anſwers*, that Church Go-
" vernors are to conſider, obſerve, ſearch and in-
" quire into the faith and religion of the candi-
" dates for the miniſtry, *only by a ſerious and ſo-*
" *lemn inquiry*, whether they do or do not already
" receive and *conſent to the wholeſome words of*
" *Chriſt*, and the form of doctrine we have re-
" ceived from the Apoſtles; and that this is *a*
" *much better way of their performing this whole*
" *matter*, than if they were to conſider, *&c.* whe-
" ther they do or do not conſent, or will or refuſe
" to give a publick declaration of their aſſent to
" certain *other* articles, conceived in *other words*
" than thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and which
" articles are of no validity, authority, or worth,
" any otherwiſe than as they agree with theſe
" words, and can be made appear to contain the
" ſenſe of them [1]".

What Mr. *Chandler* here maintains is, that the examination ought to be made *only by a ſerious and ſolemn inquiry*, and that the *conſent* required ought not to be to any *other words* than thoſe of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, *i. e.* to *ſcripture words only*, in oppoſition to *explanatory articles*.

As to the examination being made *only by a ſerious and ſolemn* inquiry, inſtead of requiring *ſubſcription* — This does not affect the merits of the main point in debate; which does not turn upon the quæſtion, whether the *declaration of aſſent* ſhould be made by the *particular form* of *ſubſcription*, or not; But whether Church Governors have authority to reject from the office of public Teachers, thoſe who *cannot declare* or make known *their aſſent* to ſuch *explanatory doctrines*, as they, who are thus intruſted with the power of ordination, judge to

[1] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 38.

to be the true Scripture-doctrines — This is the grand quæſtion.— As to the point, whether this aſſent ſhould be thus made known, or declared, by *ſubſcription*; That is only a quæſtion as to *form*. Subſcription, on many accounts, may be eſteemed by the Church of *England* to be the beſt form of doing it; as (among other reaſons) remaining a viſible ſtanding evidence, that the perſon ſo ſubſcribing, did declare ſuch aſſent at that time; and as a *record*, in juſtification of thoſe who ordained him: But, whether it be done by *ſubſcription*, or *only by a ſolemn ſerious inquiry*, it comes to the ſame thing with an honeſt man, as to any ſuppoſed *hardſhip* or *impoſition* laid upon him thereby: For I ſhall venture to repeat, with Mr. *Chandler*'s leave, that "examination by interrogatories is, with every honeſt man, equivalent to ſubſcription [k]". Any man, who will honeſtly anſwer a quæſtion, and fairly undergo a *ſolemn and ſerious inquiry* into his faith and religion, by interrogatories; will not ſcruple, in this caſe, to *ſubſcribe* ſuch his declaration of faith and religion. And there muſt lie a ſhrewd ſuſpicion, that he who would do the one, and yet refuſe the other, had ſome by-ends to ſerve, ſome ſecret reſerves, ſome private ſcheme to carry on, inconſiſtent with ſincerity and truth.

A LEARNED and judicious foreigner obſerves, that "he who ſincerely *ſubſcribes* to a creed" (and the ſame holds good with regard to explanatory articles) "upon a perſuaſion that it contains nothing but what is agreeable to Scripture, would not ſcruple, if it were required of him, to confirm the ſame even by an *oath*." This, he is ſenſible, "would diſpleaſe ſome people. "But (ſays he) I do not ſee nevertheleſs" (and yet he

F

[k] Church of *England* vindicated, p 43.

he could ſee quite as far as Mr. *Chandler*) " what " ſhould hinder any man from confirming with " an oath, *That* to *be* his opinion, which he pro- " feſſes *ſo to be*. But if we are in any *doubt*, then " indeed we ought juſtly to refuſe the *oath*; but " then neither would it be lawful for us even to " *ſubſcribe* [1] ". And this is indeed no more than what is agreeable to honeſty and fair dealing; and the like reaſoning will hold good between *profeſſing* doctrines, and *ſubſcribing* them. " Honeſt " men (as I formerly obſerved) if they do *not* " *believe* the doctrines laid down in explanatory " articles, would no more *profeſs*, than *ſubſcribe* " them; ſince it is as great a crime to *profeſs* " what we do *not believe*, as to *ſubſcribe* it. And " if they *do believe* the doctrines to be true, and " ſuch as they would *profeſs*, they would for the " ſame reaſon not ſcruple to *ſubſcribe* them too." And therefore what I then ſaid, I ſee no reaſon why I ſhould not in general ſay again, that " the " pleadings againſt *ſubſcription* [while a *ſerious* " *ſolemn profeſſion* is allowed] ſeem to me not to " procede from *ſincerity*, but from the *cunning* " *craft of men who lie in wait to deceive*. They " are calculated for thoſe only, who are diſhoneſt " enough to *profeſs with their mouth*, what they " will

[1] Qui ſincere ſubſcribit, quia certus eſt, nihil in ſymbolicis libris contineri, quod non cum ſcriptura ſacra conveniat; is quoque recte hoc jurejurando, ſi ab illo poſtuletur, confirmabit; quamquam non neſciam, quibuſdam hoc diſplicere. Sed, non video, quid obſtet, jurejurando confirmare, hanc mentem noſtram eſſe, quam profitemur; ſemperque per Dei gratiam fore, (cum veritatem ſemper retinere noſtri ſit officii) modo revera ſit. Quod ſi dubitemus ac haeſitemus, num veritati conſentanea ſint, quæ in ſymbolis docentur, aut omnino falſa ea eſſe, credamus; tum quidem recte a jurejurando nos abſtinemus, ſed tum quoque iis nec ſubſcribere licet. — *Buddei* Iſagoge Hiſtorico-Theologica ad Theologiam univerſam. Lib. 2. C. 2. Sect. xv.—Vol. 1. p. 477. Lipſiae 1730.

" will *refuſe to ſet their hands to:* The reaſon of " which, in this caſe, can only be, that they re- " gard their *reputation* more than their *conſcience*; " They are willing enough to be *diſhoneſt*, but " not to appear ſo *upon record*[m] ".— I do not by any means charge Mr. *Chandler* with any ſuch ſiniſter intentions. I ſpeak only in regard to ſuch *principles*. I would not miſrepreſent him. He does not, in the paſſage above cited, plead for examination by *a ſerious and ſolemn inquiry*, expreſly in oppoſition to *ſubſcription as ſuch*; but for ſuch inquiry in *Scripture-words*, in oppoſition to ſubſcription to *explanatory articles*; and would, I ſuppoſe, be equally againſt a *ſerious ſolemn inquiry*, if made by *ſuch articles:* But then, whether, ſuppoſing the articles of examination really were in *Scripture-words*, he would object to *ſubſcription as ſuch*, does not expreſly appear.— However, if he had no objection to ſubſcription *as ſuch*, why did he not ſay ſo? and, when he was telling us how he would have the examination made, why did he take no notice of *ſubſcription?* Nay, why did he ſay it ought to be *only* by a ſerious and ſolemn inquiry? For, as the word *only* is there placed, it will not be eaſy, *fairly* to make it relate to any thing, but to a *ſerious and ſolemn inquiry*, in oppoſition to *ſubſcription as ſuch*.—If Mr. *Chandler* therefore does object to ſubſcription *as ſuch*, and is nevertheleſs for a ſerious and ſolemn inquiry, which requires, and ſuppoſes, a ſerious and ſolemn profeſſion from the candidate; *theſe principles*, whatever Mr. *Chandler*'s *intention* may be, juſtly merit the cenſure above given, which is proper and pertinent.—If he has no objection to ſubſcription *as ſuch*; then there is an end of that part of the debate; and the quæſtion to be tried (which

[m] Church of *England* vind. p. 48.

indeed is the only quæſtion wherein the merits of the cauſe reſt) is, whether Church-Governors, or thoſe who are intruſted with the power of ordaining, and admitting perſons to the office of Public Teachers, have authority to examine the candidates as to their faith and religion (be it by *ſubſcription*, or *only by a ſolemn and ſerious inquiry*, requiring a ſolemn and ſerious profeſſion) by *explanatory* articles; and whether it be neceſſary to make their aſſent to them, a *teſt* of their *qualification* for ſuch office — or whether it be a ſufficient *teſt* of ſuch *qualification*, to have the inquiry and profeſſion made in *Scripture-words only*, which is what Mr. *Chandler* contends for.

He allows that there ought to be "an *examination* of thoſe who are to be admitted into the "miniſtry, both as to their *faith* and *morals*[n]". Now, from this one principle will follow all that we have occaſion to prove. For, if the *faith* of the candidate ought to be *examined into* by thoſe who are to admit them to, or reject them from, the office of the miniſtry; the *end* and *deſign* of ſuch examination muſt be, to *diſcover* whether the candidate be ſufficiently *qualified* for that office, in point of his faith; and in order to *diſcover this*, it muſt be *diſcovered*, as far as may be, whether he holds the faith and real *doctrines of holy Scripture*.—The quæſtion then turns upon this; whether ſuch *diſcovery* can *poſſibly be made*, by requiring an aſſent *only to Scripture-words*, as Mr. *Chandler* contends; or, whether an aſſent to *explanatory articles*, or an *explanatory profeſſion of faith*, be not *neceſſary* to that end. The latter of which I think muſt be affirmed by every one, who is not prejudiced, or has no by-ends to ſerve. For, ſince various, different, inconſiſtent interpretations and com-

[n] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 49.

comments, have rendered it impoſſible to *diſcover*, in *what Senſe* any candidate underſtands the *words of Scripture*; or *which* of the *different* and *inconſiſtent doctrines* he *holds*; when he *expreſſes* himſelf *only in the mere words of Scripture*; it follows, that ſince it is *neceſſary* to *know*, as far as may be, whether the candidate holds the real *doctrines of Scripture*, in order to diſcover whether he has the *qualification* for a Public Teacher (the neceſſity of *diſcovering* which, follows from the *allowed neceſſity* of *examination*) it is *neceſſary* to *that end*, to know *in what ſenſe* he *underſtands* the *words* of Scripture *uſed* in the examination; which immediately infers the *neceſſity* of an *explanatory inquiry*.

And ſince they, who are to examine and diſcover *whether* the candidate be *qualified* or not, muſt, by ſuppoſition, be allowed to be the *judges* whether he *be* ſo qualified or not; and ſince *this qualification*, which they are thus to be judges of, is, whether he holds the real *doctrines of Scripture*; it follows, that they muſt be allowed to *determine*, in this caſe, what *are*, and what are *not*, the real *doctrines of Scripture*.—And thus, from it's being allowed only, that there ought to be an *examination* into the faith of thoſe who are to be admitted into the miniſtry; it follows, that ſuch examination, if made to any ſufficient purpoſe, muſt be by an *explanatory inquiry*.

If Mr. *Chandler* will ſay, that they who are to be judges *whether* the candidate holds the real doctrines of Scripture, are not to be judges *what are*, and what *are not*, the real doctrines of Scripture; he will ſay what is abſurd, and contradictory to itſelf.

If he will ſay, that it *may be diſcovered* in *what ſenſe* the candidate *underſtands* the *words of Scripture*, which have been underſtood in *different* ſenſes (and ſo contain *different* doctrines) by examining

amining *only* by the *words* of Scripture; he will be ſo good to explain to us *how* this may be done; and which will be a diſcovery, I will venture to ſay, more curious than ever Mr. *Chandler* has yet made.

If he ſay, that it is *not neceſſary* for the examiners to *know*, in *which* of the various and *different ſenſes* the candidate *underſtands* the *words of ſcripture*; this will *ſuperſede all examination*, properly ſo called; as it will be denying that an *inquiry* ought to be made, as far as may be, *whether* the candidate *holds* the real *doctrines* of Scripture, or *not*; ſince *this* cannot be in any degree *known*, while it is *unknown* what the doctrines *are*, which he *does* hold to be *Scripture-doctrine*; and will center in this at laſt, that the only *examination* ought to be (what is, properly, in this caſe, no examination at all) whether the candidate believes, *in general*, the *words of Scripture* to be the *word of God*. It will ſuperſede his *own ſcheme* of examining by the *words* of Scripture; ſince nothing more can be *diſcovered* by an *aſſent to Scripture-words only*, than that the candidate aſſents to thoſe words being the *word of God*; for, as to any particular *determinate ſenſe* of thoſe words, you are not, it ſeems, to inquire; or, if you do, he is not obliged to ſatisfy you, and that's as well.

To admit therefore, that there ought to be an *examination* made, whether the candidates for the office of Public Teachers hold the real *doctrines of ſcripture*; and yet to deny that ſuch examination ought to be made by an *explanatory inquiry*, or demanding an *explanatory profeſſion* and aſſent; is arguing, after all that has been, or can be urged in defence of it, moſt abſurdly and ridiculouſly; and indeed, whatever opinion theſe gentlemen, or their friends, may have of it, it is really one of the weakeſt, and moſt indefenſible topics that they diſplay

diſplay upon,—If men ſubſcribe *only to Scripture words*; what do they ſubſcribe to, as the caſe ſtands, but every man to his *own private opinion*, however different and contradictory, under the *covert* of Scripture? And then, what uſe for any examination at all? The very offering themſelves as candidates for the miniſtry, will be a ſufficient examination; ſince that alone *ſuppoſes* that they believe the Scripture to be the *word of God*, and will ſubſcribe to the *words* of Scripture. As to what they believe to be the *ſenſe* and meaning of any part of Scripture; That, excuſe 'em, they are not obliged to tell you; and therefore, whether they be *Arians*, *Socinians*, *Sabellians*, &c. they are to be admitted as *Public Teachers*, and to have thereby full licence, power and authority, to diſſeminate their own opinions, though in oppoſition, and contradiction to the avowed doctrines of that Church into which they are to be admitted.—The *Devil* quoted the *words of Scripture* to our Lord, and I make no doubt would have *ſubſcribed* to them too—Every ſpecies of hereſy, every heretic, every one who holds doctrines the *moſt different* and *contradictory*, every one who believes in general the Scripture to be the *word of God*, will ſubſcribe to the *words of Scripture*—and laugh at us when they have done—and yet, upon Mr. *Chandler*'s ſcheme, they are all, to a man, to be admitted as *Public Teachers* in the *Church of England*. But ſurely, the uſe of ſubſcription, or examination, is not merely to diſcover whether the candidates believe, *in general*, the Scripture to be the *word of God*; but to prevent the *confuſion* of teaching *different*, *inconſiſtent*, and *contradictory* doctrines by licence and authority; which whoever pleads for, muſt deny the *Church* to be, in any conſiſtent ſenſe, a *viſible ſociety*; for a viſible ſociety, in which every man is at liberty to teach

ever

ever ſo many different, inconſiſtent doctrines; confined only to admit Scripture to be the *word of God*; is juſt ſuch a *viſible ſociety*, as that *Nation* would be, where every man ſhould have a liberty of explaining and holding the *particular laws* in his *own private ſenſe*, agreeing in this only, in general, that the *Law* is the *Law of the Land*—Schemes theſe, utterly ſubverſive of all legal eſtabliſhments, and Church-Communion.——*Church Communion* is a ſociety of perſons, agreeing in the *ſame ſyſtem* of opinions and doctrines, and *knowing* what it is which each other *do* believe and agree in: But, upon Mr. *Chandler*'s ſcheme, the *communion* of the *Church of England*, is to be a *company of people* got together, with a book, which they call the *Bible*, containing a *ſet of words*, which have *ſome ſenſe or other*, and by which all Public Teachers are to be, what they call, *examined*; that is, they are to profeſs that theſe *ſame words* are the *word of God*; but what the *meaning* of them is, That no body is to aſk them any quæſtions about; they are to put *what ſenſe upon them they pleaſe*, and to *teach* that ſenſe to any body that will hear them; who are thus to be taught, ſeverally, all the *various ſenſes* and meanings, which theſe Public Teachers, diſperſed over the nation, ſhall think proper; and all theſe are to be, in different places, and by different perſons, delivered as, each of them, the *one*, *only*, *genuin ſenſe* of this book; and yet all theſe different Teachers and their flocks, profeſſing and teaching, every one, different and contradictory doctrines, are to be eſteemed *one Society*, and *one Communion*—a Communion of the *faithfull*, without any *common faith* at all; a *union* of *oppoſites*; a *Society*, where *every body differs* and *no body agrees*—This is *Comprehenſion* with a witneſs!—This is Mr. *Chandler*'s ſcheme—But I ſpare him,

him, and will puſh it no farther—To ſhew it only, is to expoſe it ſufficiently.

THESE general obſervations upon the *neceſſity* of an *explanatory inquiry* and aſſent, in order to diſcover the proper qualifications of the candidates for the Chriſtian Miniſtry, are a ſufficient anſwer to all Mr. *Chandler*'s long harangue under this head; which centers in this one plea, of an *aſſent* to *Scripture-words only*°. But ſince he, or his friends, may not think that I ſhew reſpect enough to his *learned performance*, ſhould I ſo diſmiſs it; I ſhall take the pains, for once, to follow him in *all his wanderings*, and to give it a *thorough examination*; and therefore, as the *old plea* comes up *over and over again*, the reader will excuſe me, if I am *obliged to repeat*.

AND now, what is become of Mr. *Chandler*'s "*much better way* of performing the inquiry into "the faith and opinions of the candidates for the "miniſtry, by a *ſerious and ſolemn inquiry*, whe- "ther they *conſent to the wholeſome words of Chriſt*, "and the *form of doctrine received from the Apo-* "*ſtles?*"—Does he not know, that the *wholeſome words of Chriſt* have been interpreted in *different ſenſes?* How then will an examination by the *words alone*, diſcover in *which* of thoſe *different ſenſes* the *words* are *underſtood* by the perſon examined?—The quæſtion is, or ought to be, whether the candidate holds, not merely the *wholſome*

 words,

° The reader may ſee what Dr. *Stebbing* has judiciouſly ſaid upon this ſubject, in his *Defence of the firſt head of the Report of the Committee of the lower houſe of Convocation*, Part II. Sect. II. Ch. iv, v.——Polemical Tracts, p. 159, *&c.* See alſo Mr. *Harveſt*'s Letter to Mr. *Chandler*; wherein, by rightly debating the quæſtion upon the foot of *neceſſity* only, he has reduced it to a narrow compaſs; and has (I think) made good the point he undertook to prove, with great ſtrength of reaſon and argument.

words, but the *wholſome doctrine* of Chriſt, *contained* in *thoſe words*; and, in order to know this, it is *neceſſary* to require ſome *determinate ſenſe* to be given of them; otherwiſe, the examination ſerves to no end or purpoſe, but is mere farce and mockery.

2. In the next place, I proceded to inquire, whether there were not ſome plain *apoſtolical directions*, to the governors of the Church in particular, *expreſsly relating* to the *admiſſion of perſons to the miniſtry*; and what might be concluded from them.

Firſt, I obſerved, that *Timothy*, when appointed by St. *Paul* to reſide as Biſhop at *Epheſus*, was impowered to ſee that none taught any other doctrine, than what they had received from our Lord and his Apoſtles [p]—that St. *Paul* alſo directs him to *commit* the doctrine of the Goſpel *to faithful men, who ſhall* be ἱκανοὶ, *fit*, or *duly qualified* to *teach* others [q]. To ſuch only was he to commit the doctrine he had received; *i. e.* ſuch only was he to ordain to the office of *Public Teachers*. From hence I argued, that *Timothy*, in order to *know* and diſtinguiſh who were, and who were not, thus *fit* and *qualified* to *teach others*; was, no doubt, hereby impowered to make uſe of ſuch methods as the *nature of the thing* neceſſarily required; to *examine* into their *faith* and opinions—And ſince St. *Paul* would not have thought thoſe perſons to be *fit* or duly *qualified* to *teach others*, who did not hold the doctrines, which he and the reſt of the Apoſtles had taught; this was a plain apoſtolical direction, to admit none to the office of Public Teachers, but ſuch as held the *ſame faith* with the *Church* [r].

Upon

[p] 1 Tim. i. 3. [q] 2 Tim. ii. 2.
[r] Church of *England* vindicated, p. 37—39.

UPON this Mr. *Chandler* makes a fearful outcry—" The ſame faith (ſays he) with whom? It " ſhould have been *with* St. *Paul* and the reſt of " the Apoſtles: But the *Champion*, by a ſlight of " hand, *filches away the Apoſtles*, that were in his " premiſes, and, in his concluſion ſubſtitutes the " word *Church* in the room of it[s].—The reader will obſerve the beauty and elegance of Mr. *Chandler*'s ſtile and manner; where, by figures ill-paired, you are at once preſented with the *motley image*, of a *Champion*, a *thief*, and a *jugler*.—It muſt be allowed Mr. *Chandler* can *paint* well, however he may *reaſon*. Here you ſee a *Champion* in complete harneſs—doing what? attempting at leaſt ſomething equal to his figure?—why no; but a *Champion*, with one hand playing *with cups and balls*, and, with the other, *picking your pocket*; which is a ſcene much of a piece with That, where the moon, the earth, and the ſun are introduced—*dancing the hey*.—The *Champion*, with a *ſlight of hand*, *filches away* the Apoſtles—a *mob of metaphors!* to be equalled by nothing but That of a late learned Author, who tells us of *an underſtanding*, *condenſed with the frigid ſubtilty of ſchool moonſhine*.—This I ſuppoſe is (as *Bayes* ſays) the *new way* of writing.—*School moonſhine*, and *frigid ſubtilty* are pretty tolerable; and I am at no great loſs to conceive (ſince the reading ſome late books and pamphlets) that an *underſtanding* may be *condenſed*; But how it is to be condenſed by *moonſhine*, though it be even ſchool moonſhine, is a piece of philoſophy, which the reader will excuſe me if I do not ſo readily comprehend.—But to return to Mr. *Chandler*—

" Which Church (ſays he) I would willingly " know, doth the gentleman mean? The church

[s] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 42.

" of *Sweden*, *Moſcow*, *Geneva*, *Scotland*, *Eng-*
" *land*, or *Rome?* All theſe churches will claim
" the ſame right, *&c.* But did he really think
" (ſays he) that ſo *palpable a fallacy* would paſs
" upon any of his readers[t]?"—If it were a *palpable fallacy*, and what would *paſs upon none of my readers*; why did Mr. *Chandler* give himſelf ſo much *needleſs trouble*, and miſſpend ſo much of his precious time, in *labouring*, for ſeveral pages, to detect a *palpable fallacy?* But the truth is, the labour required was, to *make it appear* a fallacy, and to darken the argument, and that is the whole ſecret. The *fallacy* will appear to be *his own.* He is much miſtaken, if he thinks my argument at all the worſe, for his having changed, *the faith of the Church*, into, *the faith of the Apoſtles.* I am very willing the argument ſhould ſo ſtand; for the force of it will be juſt the ſame as it was before.

By *the faith of the Church*, I meant and intended no more than, *the faith of the Apoſtles*; and expreſsly ſo explained it in the very next page; of ſo little force or uſe, did I look upon this ſame *palpable fallacy.*—The Apoſtles, and their diſciples, were the *then preſent Church*; and this argument was intended to prove, that this direction to *Timothy*, was to authorize him to examine and inquire into the faith and opinions of the candidates for the miniſtry, and to admit none but ſuch as held the faith and doctrines *of the Apoſtles*, who were *the then Church*; and that the *ſucceeding Governors* of the *Chriſtian Church*, are hereby *equally authorized* to examine and inquire, and to admit none to the miniſtry, but ſuch as hold the *ſame faith.*—This was what the argument was deſigned to prove: But then, if the Governors of the Church are hereby impowered, to admit none to the miniſtry

[t] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 42, 43.

niſtry but ſuch who hold the *faith of the Apoſtles*; they muſt be ſuppos'd to have ſome fixed *determinate* idea *what that faith is.*—A faith in the mere *words* of the Scripture, without any *determinate ſenſe* affixed to them, is no faith at all; and this determinate ſenſe muſt, *to them*, in the nature of things, be what *appears to them*, according to the beſt of their judgment, to be ſuch ſenſe. A *right to examine* the candidates in the *faith of Scripture*, *ſuppoſes* a *right* to affix ſome *determinate Senſe* to the *words* of Scripture, to examine by. And ſince they muſt believe That to be the *Apoſtles doctrine*, which *appears to them ſo to be*; and have a *right to examine* by the *Apoſtles doctrine*; they have therefore a *right* which infers, in the exerciſe of it, the neceſſity of examining by *That* which *appears to them* to be the Apoſtles doctrine—A direction therefore to the Governors of the Chriſtian Church, to admit none to the office of the miniſtry, but ſuch who hold the *faith and doctrines of the Apoſtles*; is a direction to them which infers, in the execution of it, a neceſſity of admitting none but ſuch who hold *that faith and doctrine* which the Governors of the Church, according to the beſt of their judgment and conſcience, *believe to be the faith and doctrine of the Apoſtles.*—And this direction to the *Chriſtian Church at large*, muſt be *equally* a direction of the ſame force to the Governors of *each diviſion* of the Chriſtian Church; unleſs Mr. *Chandler* has found out a way to prove, that the *whole* does not *conſiſt* of *its parts*—The objection therefore which Mr. *Chandler* thinks ſo formidable, *viz.* that this, according to my argument, is "an apoſtolical di-"rection to the Churches of *Sweden*, *Moſcow*, "*Geneva*, *Scotland*, *England*, and *Rome*, to admit "none to the office of Publick Teachers, but *Lu-*"*therans*, *Greeks*, *Calviniſts*, *Kirk-men*, *Epiſcopa-*"*lians*, or *Papiſts*[u]"; is really nothing but *fallacy*.

[u] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 42, 43.

The

The *apoſtolical direction* to theſe ſeveral Churches, is *one and the ſame*, and without any inconſiſtency; to admit none to the office of Public Teachers, but ſuch who hold *the faith and doctrines of the Apoſtles*; not to each Church, as ſuch, to admit none but thoſe who hold *their particular diſtinguiſhing doctrines*.—The Authority claimed, and rightly claimed, by each Church, is to admit thoſe only who hold *the faith and doctrines of the Apoſtles*.—The *event*, of admitting, in any Church, thoſe only who hold *their particular doctrines*, which may happen to be falſe and erroneous, is only *accidental*. — All men are *fallible*, and therefore all Churches, all Councils may err; and the *event* indeed may be, admitting none but ſuch who hold thoſe *erroneous* doctrines: Yet the *authority* contended for, is right; which is no more than to admit thoſe only into the office of the miniſtry, who hold *the faith of Scripture*; But this inferring a neceſſity in the execution of it, yea making it their *duty*, to admit none but thoſe who hold that faith which they, according to the beſt of their judgment and conſcience, *believe to be* the faith of Scripture; and they not being infallible; they may *err* in the *uſe* of this authority—And where they do ſo *ſincerely*, they have a right to all that may be alledged in behalf of any other perſons, who *conſcientiouſly miſtake* in the *performance of their duty*—They will ſo far *act wrong*; But how *wrong?* not, as exerciſing an *authority* they have *no right* to; an authority, inferring, in the exerciſe of it, a neceſſity of admitting none but ſuch who hold that faith, which they, according to the beſt of their judgment and conſcience, believe to be the faith of Scripture — In *that*, in exerciſing *that authority*, as ſuch, they do *not err*; their *error* is, in the *particular application* of that authority; not, in *exerciſing the authority*, inferring, in the execution of

of it, a neceſſity of admitting none but thoſe who hold, what they, according to the beſt of their judgment and conſcience, believe to be the true doctrine of Scripture; but, in *miſtaking* what the true doctrine of Scripture *is*: yet, being liable to err in the *uſe* of the authority, is no more than is, and muſt be incident to the uſe of *all* authority, however *rightly claimed*, when left to the exerciſe of *human wiſdom*; and therefore does not, cannot render null, or be any argument againſt the general authority itſelf.—So that Mr. *Chandler*, with a great profuſion of words, has laid a mighty ſtreſs upon an argument, which concludes nothing for his purpoſe.— And ſince he himſelf admits the *authority* of admitting none but thoſe who hold the faith of Scripture; all that he has here ſaid will only end in the *old pretence*, that this authority ought to be exerciſed, not according to what appears to be, to thoſe who are to examine, the true faith of Scripture, according to the beſt of their judgment and conſcience; not, according to any one *determinate ſenſe* of Scripture; but, according to the *mere words* of Scripture only, without *any explicite ſenſe* affixed to thoſe words. But this has been abundantly proved to be an idle plea — Mr. *Chandler* therefore has gained no advantage by changing *the Church*, in my argument, for *the Apoſtles*, which he ſays I had *filched away*; nor has done any thing by his *Old-Bailey-language*, but attempted to ſhew his wit, at the expence of his manners.

Mr. *Chandler* aſks, "can any one think that "this *Church-Champion* is in earneſt, when he "affirms, that an apoſtolical injunction to teach "no other doctrine but our Lord's and his Apo-"ſtles, is really an *apoſtolick injunction* to hold the "ſame faith with what is called the Church *now*, "whether underſtood of any particular, or the "univerſal Church?[x]" — It is a very difficult

[x] Caſe of Subſcript. p. 43.

matter

matter to make any one ſee where the force or ſtreſs of an argument lies; when, added to an inveterate prejudice, there appears to be ſuch a *confuſion of Ideas* as in the preſent caſe.—Did I affirm, that an apoſtolical *injunction* to teach only *Scripture-doctrine*, is an apoſtolical *injunction* to hold the ſame faith with the Churches of *Sweden*, *Moſcow*, *Geneva*, or *Rome*? or that an apoſtolical injunction to admit none to the miniſtry, but thoſe who hold the faith of Scripture, is an apoſtolical injunction to admit none but *Lutherans*, *Greeks*, *Calviniſts*, or *Papiſts* into each Church? No ſuch concluſion will follow from my argument; nor does it require any ſuch. The argument and concluſion are, that an apoſtolical *injunction* to the Governors of the Chriſtian Church at large, to admit none to the office of Public Teachers, but ſuch who, upon examination, appear to hold the faith and *doctrines of Scripture*; is an apoſtolical *injunction* to them, which infers, in the execution of it, a neceſſity of admitting none but ſuch who hold that faith and doctrine, which the Governors of the Church *believe*, according to the beſt of their judgment and conſcience, *to be* the *true ſcripture faith* — that *this injunction* muſt be equally an *injunction* to *each diviſion* of the Chriſtian Church.—This is all that I have *affirmed*, and all *the injunction* I have argued from. Nor does it follow from any thing I did affirm, that this was an *injunction* to every particular diviſion of the Chriſtian Church, to admit none to their miniſtry, but thoſe who hold the *particular errors*, or miſtakes of theſe Churches; and which *accidental conſequence* does not invalidate the *authority* of the general injunction, as above explained—Their particular errors, or miſtakes in the *application*, or *uſe* of this injunction, do not invalidate the *general injunction* — Their *fallibility* in underſtanding the

Scrip-

Scriptures, does not prove that they, whoſe office it is to admit perſons to the miniſtry, muſt not therefore affix that ſenſe to the words of Scripture, which they, upon mature deliberation, believe to be the true ſenſe; the neceſſity of doing which, the right of examining infers, in the exerciſe of it. Their being *liable to errors here* does not infer the expediency of examining by *Scripture-words only*; ſince That would be, as the caſe ſtands, no examination at all; and ſince the *neceſſity* of *explanatory examination* in general, has been proved.—All Mr. *Chandler*'s objections therefore, from accidental *conſequences* and *errors* in the *application* of this injunction, incident to the *exerciſe* of *all injunctions*, are of no weight; ſince theſe *principles* are what, I ſhall venture to ſay, Mr. *Chandler* is not able to diſprove; and when I *affirm this*, I will aſſure him, *I am in earneſt*.

" Can any one, (ſays he) who hath any vene-
" ration for the apoſtolick character, bear to ſee
" their ſacred authority preſſed into the ſupport of
" a principle, that ſubverts both their authority
" and doctrine, and makes them give their ſanc-
" tion to the *contradictory impoſitions* and ſubſcrip-
" tions practiced by the ſeveral Churches in the
" Chriſtian world"?[1]—I have ſhewn that the *apoſtolical authority* which I inſiſt upon, gives no *ſanction* to the *contradictory doctrines* of the ſeveral churches; which are only *accidental*, from their *miſtakes* in the *uſe* of that authority. What therefore Mr. *Chandler* either can, or cannot *bear*, little concerns me.—He may not *bear*, perhaps, that the *Church* ſhould have *any authority at all*; but would have all Chriſtians *independent* of all authority; and ſo is pleading for *chriſtian licentiouſneſs*, under the ſpecious name of *chriſtian liberty*; and he may not *bear* to have the contrary truths proved:

[1] Caſe of Subſcript. p. 43, 44.

But they who have as great a *veneration* for the *apoſtolic character* as Mr. *Chandler*, and a more true and rational veneration, may think that it is *his* ſcheme which *preſſes their ſacred authority into the ſupport of principles, which ſubvert their authority and doctrine*; by making it ſuch an authority, as would, in the nature of things, corrupt their doctrine; that it is *his* ſcheme alone, which makes their authority a *ſanction* to the ſeveral *contradictory doctrines* which have been founded upon *Scripture words*; while he makes their authority to be no more, than an authority for examining by the *mere words* of Scripture only; when, at the ſame time, thoſe words have been uſed to ſignify all *thoſe* ſeveral *contradictory doctrines*; and which, according to *his* ſcheme, we are never to *diſtinguiſh* upon in the examination.—This is indeed citing the *apoſtolical authority* as a *ſanction* to *confuſion* in the Church; by making it an authority to admit into the church *all ſects* and *parties whatever*, as *public* and *authorized teachers*; and therefore Mr. *Chandler* would have ſhewn more prudence, if, before he threw out his reflections, he had conſidered a little better *where they would fall.*

He ſets himſelf forth, as "vindicating the ho-"neſty, integrity, common ſenſe, prudence, and "divine authority of the Apoſtles, which ſuch "men (ſays he) as I am arguing againſt are doing "all they can, I will not ſay *willingly*, but by "the doctrine they teach, to bring into ſuſpicion "and diſgrace[z]."—Theſe are *ſtrong charges*; 'tis well they are ſupported by *weak arguments*; which ſhews however, that *ſuch men as I am arguing againſt*, are ever ready to *calumniate*, where they *are not able to convict*; that, tho' we are ſafe enough from their *reaſoning*, we are not ſo from their

[z] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 44.

their *intention*; and though they *cannot*, yet are *willing* to bring all thoſe who differ from them, *into ſuſpicion and diſgrace*.—This is the *Chriſtian Charity*, the *boaſted moderation* of Mr. *Chandler!* by which, 'tis plain, that ſuch perſons mean only, charity and moderation to *themſelves*.

But, "pardon me (ſays he) my friend, that I "have forgot myſelf, and grown *warm* on this "occaſion [a]".———*Leſs heat*, indeed, and *more light*, would have been of ſervice to him and his cauſe; and it might have been full as complaiſant, and much more juſt, if he had aſked pardon, not of thoſe againſt whom his *warmth* was *not* directed, but of thoſe againſt whom it *was*—As to his having *forgot himſelf*; That, I apprehend, might have been ſaid with much more propriety, if he had *grown calm*.

"I will not yield my conſcience or judg-"ment (ſays Mr. *Chandler*) to be determined by "the dictates of any mortal men upon the face of "God's earth [b]."—Pray, good Sir, compoſe yourſelf a little, and be not ſo angry and vehement. 'Tis nothing but a phantom of your own imagination that affrights you—Pray be calm! remember, you are *grown warm*, and have *forgot yourſelf*; and this is nothing but a *mere vapour*, raiſed only by the *heat* of your *own paſſions*. Your conſcience and your judgment are ſafe. Is aſking you only, what your judgment is, *dictating* to it? Is requiring from you, as a teſt of your qualification for a Public Teacher, a declaration what your *own determination* is, *determining* your judgment *for you?* If you will *grow calm*, you muſt acknowledge that it is *not*; and that no man in the church of *England* claims, or pretends to any ſuch authority—This therefore is endeavouring to put

[a] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 44. [b] Ibid. p. 39.

the *old trick* upon the reader; though the fallacy is ſo notorious, that I ſhould much wonder, if it could long impoſe upon *any mortal man upon the face of God's earth.*—

" By the ſcriptures (ſays he) I humbly endea-
" vour to form my own ſentiments of Chriſtiani-
" ty, and by theſe, and no other will I ever exa-
" mine thoſe who apply to me, to receive my
" aſſiſtance, *&c.*—All who receive theſe as the rule
" of their faith, and live by them as the rule of
" their morals, I own ſo far as the ſound members
" of Chriſt's body, I embrace them as my brethren,
" *&c.* I will, if other qualifications are not
" wanting, willingly receive them into the mini-
" ſtry[c]."—Would not any one imagine, from all this, that Mr. *Chandler* was arguing againſt ſomebody who denied the *Scriptures* to be the *rule of faith*, and morals, and examination for the miniſtry; and that this was the quæſtion between Mr. *Chandler* and me? and yet there is not one word of truth in this repreſentation. I allow *Scripture* to be the *rule* in all theſe caſes, as well as he does; But the diſpute between us is, whether this *rule* of *Scripture* is now to be confined to the *mere words* of Scripture, after they have had ſo many different, and contradictory ſenſes affixed to them? and therefore, if he would have had his reader underſtand his ſentiments *fairly*, he ſhould have expreſſed himſelf thus—" By the *mere words* of Scripture, and no
" other, though they ſtand, in different mens
" mouths, for very *different* and *contradictory doc-*
" *trines*, I will ever *examine* thoſe who apply to
" me. All who receive the *mere words* of Scrip-
" ture, though they *mean* ever ſo *different* and
" *contradictory doctrines* by them, I will willingly,
" if other qualifications are not wanting, receive them

[c] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 40.

" them to the office of Public Teachers. *And* " *This I declare, without exception of any denomina-* " *tion or party of Chriſtians whatſoever* [d] ;" be they *Arians, Socinians, Sabellians, Antinomians, Lutherans, Greeks, Calviniſts*, or *Papiſts*, and a hundred more. Since they all receive the ſcripture *words* as the rule of their faith and morals ; though every one underſtands *thoſe words* in *different ſenſes* ; yet, by the *mere words* of ſcripture notwithſtanding, and no other, Mr. *Chandler* will *examine* (as he calls it) and admit them all to be Public Teachers of all theſe their ſeveral *different* and *contradictory doctrines*. If ſuch a ſcheme of univerſal latitude be defenſible, upon rational principles ; I think no ſcheme in the world need deſpair of it.

He adds—" I hope to die in full friendſhip " with them, and to be happy with them as my " companions in a better ſtate [e]."—I am as willing and deſirous to die, yea and to live too, in charity with them, as Mr. *Chandler*. I ſee no reaſon why difference of opinions, ſuppoſing men only to be honeſt and ſincere in them, however miſtaken, ſhould be looked upon as any ſufficient cauſe of enmity, anger, malice, or perſecution : And whatever their errors be in point of faith ; provided only that their examination has been conſcientious and ſincere, with a real deſire to embrace the truth, and according to the beſt of their ſeveral judgments and capacities, their ſeveral ſituations, and means of knowledge afforded them ; I hope to be happy with them in a better ſtate ; being well aſſured, that an infinitely benevolent and merciful Being, will make all reaſonable *allowances* for the *weakneſs* and *fallibility* of *human wiſdom* ; allowances, which every man ought in charity to expect will

[d] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 40. [e] Ibid. p. 40.

will be granted to the errors of others, which he has ſo much occaſion to hope for in regard to his own. I am ſeriouſly convinced, that the longer we live, and the farther we examine into things; the more reaſon we ſhall find for mutual charity. The more true knowledge we acquire, ſerves but to ſhew us our ignorance the plainer; and when we come ſeriouſly, and diſpaſſionately to ſearch into things, we find ſo many difficulties attending what we before perhaps looked upon to be very plain; that it ſhould teach us modeſty and humility in reſpect to our own opinions, and charity and mutual forbearance in regard to the opinions of others—Theſe are truly my ſentiments, not only, as Mr. *Chandler* ſays, in regard of "all denomina-"tions or party of *Chriſtians*," but in regard of *all mankind*, who ſincerely and conſcientiouſly differ in their faith or opinions.

But all this while, the debate between us ſtands juſt where it did.—The quæſtion is, not, with whom we may hope to *live and die in charity*, and to be *happy in a better ſtate*; but, whom we are to *admit to the office of Public Teachers*, in the *viſible* Church. Theſe are two very different quæſtions. —If any one holds That to be ſcripture doctrine, which I believe not to be ſo; or *vice verſa*; though I ſuppoſe him in error, yet his honeſty and ſincerity (if he have really thoſe qualifications) will juſtify me in *living in charity with him*, and in *hoping that he may be happy in a better ſtate:* But if I am to *examine* ſuch a perſon for the *office of a Public Teacher* in *the viſible church*; I cannot admit him to that office; Becauſe That would either be acknowledging that he held the true Scripture-faith, when, by ſuppoſition, I really believe the contrary; or elſe giving him licence and authority to ſpread and propagate doctrines, as Scripture-doctrines, which I believe not to be ſo; which

which would be acting inconſiſtently with my *office* and *duty*, and introducing confuſion into the Chriſtian Church. For, if *holding the faith of Scripture*, be a *neceſſary qualification* for a *Public Teacher*; and if it be my *office* to *examine whether* the perſon have *that qualification* or not; This neceſſarily ſuppoſes, that *I am to judge* whether he *has* it or *not*; which again ſuppoſes, that I am to *determine*, according to what appears to me to be the true Scripture-doctrine. If therefore I find, that he does *not* hold *That* for *Scripture-doctrine*, which I do, or *vice verſa*; I muſt determine that he has *not* the *qualification* required; and therefore, though I may be contented to *live and die in charity with him*, and may *hope* that *God will make allowances for human weakneſs and ignorance*, and that his *honeſty* and *ſincerity* may be pleaded in excuſe for his *errors*, ſuppoſing them ſo to be; yet, ſo long as I believe them *to be errors*, I cannot admit him to the office of a Public Teacher, without a violation of the rules of *reaſon*, *duty*, and *conſcience*. My *charity* for him ſtill remains the ſame: But I muſt have ſome charity for *myſelf* alſo; and not do, what I think my *reaſon*, *duty* and *conſcience* oblige me *not* to do.—I leave *his* conſcience and private judgment free; let him leave *mine* ſo too; which tell me, that I *ought not to admit*, as a Public Teacher, one who will teach doctrines for ſcripture-doctrines, which I believe *not to be ſo*, but contrary to the *true faith* of Scripture.—Every man who has a *truſt* or an *office* committed to him, is to diſcharge it according to his *judgment* and *conſcience*, not excepting, I ſuppoſe, Church-Governors. A great cry is made for the *freedom of private judgment*, for *conſcience* and *chriſtian liberty*; But it is all, it ſeems, to be on *one ſide* only; as if the *Church of England* had not an *equal right* to theſe, with the *Diſſenters*.—If Mr. *Chandler* therefore would but allow to *others*, what he demands for

himſelf

himſelf and brethren, the controverſy would appear upon a more *equitable foot*.—I know the dernier reſort of Mr. *Chandler* in this, as in former caſes, will be (for indeed there is nothing elſe left for him to ſay) that it is neither our office nor our duty, to examine, or judge any farther, than *Scripture-words*—But This is a plea that has been ſhewn, and will be farther ſhewn as we go on, to be ſo indefenſible, and even ridiculous; that whenever, in the courſe of any argument, I ſhall have driven him to this reſource, I ſhall look upon it as *abſolutely confuted*——

MR. *Chandler* objects, that if the Apoſtle's direction authorizes each particular Church, to admit none but thoſe who hold what each of thoſe Churches hold to be Scripture-faith; it would be an apoſtolical direction to admit none but *Lutherans*, *Greeks*, *Calviniſts*, *Kirkmen*, *Epiſcopalians*, or *Papiſts*—This I have replied to; But he adds—"or thoſe who hold the *monſtrous jumble* of all "theſe contradictory opinions[f]."—Surely Mr. *Chandler* has here again *forgot himſelf*, and has miſtaken his own ſcheme for mine—The ſcheme he is pleading for, would indeed admit thoſe who hold the *monſtrous jumble* of every hereſy and falſe doctrine, that has ever been fathered upon Scripture; But, by what invention Mr. *Chandler* can contrive, to fix any thing of this nature upon me, I own requires a better head than mine to comprehend—I never heard of any one Church yet, which acknowledged, as the doctrine of their Church, the *monſtrous jumble* he talks of; though perhaps we may in time, and are likely enough ſo to do, if Mr. *Chandler*'s ſcheme ſhould come to maturity.

BUT is there not a little inconſiſtency here, in my friend's reaſoning?—He objects to my ſcheme, that, according to That, the Apoſtle's direction, is

[f] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 43.

is a direction to admit none but *Lutherans*, *Greeks*, &c. into their reſpective Churches; *or*, thoſe who hold the *monſtrous jumble* of all theſe—What! object to my ſcheme for being *too narrow*, and *too broad* at the ſame time? — If it be *comprehenſive* enough, to take in thoſe who hold the *monſtrous jumble* of all theſe (though, I muſt own, I don't ſee how;) why then does he find fault with it, as admitting none but *Lutherans*, *Greeks*, &c. into *each Church reſpectively?* And if, on the contrary, it be true, that it admits *none* but *Lutherans*, *Greeks* &c. into *each Church reſpectively*; why then does he object, that it admits the *monſtrous jumble* of all theſe together?—

AGAIN—why does he object to my ſcheme, on account of its *latitude*, as admitting thoſe who hold the *monſtrous jumble* he mentions; when, according to his own, *a much more monſtrous jumble* ſtill muſt inevitably enter — *All*, who receive the *mere words* of Scripture, whom Mr. *Chandler* expreſsly declares he will "embrace as brethren, "communicate with them, and willingly receive "into the miniſtry;" and this he "declares "without exception of any denomination, or party "of Chriſtians whatſoever, or whatever be the "external diſadvantages they are under, or op-"probrious names that are given them." * Surely this is opening the door for a *monſtrous jumble indeed!*— Yet this is the gentleman, who, in the very *tail* of theſe *inconſiſtences*, to ſhew that his *breeding* is of the ſame ſize with his *reaſoning*, complements me with a *ſcrap of his latin*,—*naviget Anticyram* — in return for which, I might ſend him to the ſame Author for *two more*, and leave him to apply them as he ſees proper [s]—But I ſhall only

* Caſe of Subſcript. p. 40.

[s] Neſcio an Anticyram ratio illi deſtinet omnem.
——tribus Anticyris caput inſanabile——
Hor. ſerm. L. 2. Ecl. 3. and De Art. Poet.

only adviſe him, to avoid ſuch *inconſiſtences* and *contradictions* for the future; if he would have his performances have any *reputation* for *accuracy* or *reaſoning*; or for any thing more, than a *looſe, declamatory, railing accuſation.*

THE admitting a *jumble of all ſorts of doctrines and opinions* is, I admit, an objection to any ſcheme; and 'tis for that reaſon I condemn Mr. *Chandler*'s, as tending directly to introduce this confuſion— *Mine*, he ſays (for that I ſuppoſe, of the *two contradictory charges*, is what he will chuſe to ſtand by) will admit none but *Lutherans, Greeks, Calviniſts, Kirkmen, Epiſcopalians*, or *Papiſts*, into each reſpective Church — The difference is, that *his* would admit *them*, and a *hundred more*, altogether *into one and the ſame Church:* And is it at all better, to have a variety of falſe and inconſiſtent doctrines in a Church, taught at random, than one, ſuppoſing it ſuch? In the latter ſituation indeed, the true ſcripture doctrine will not be taught: But will the caſe be much better in the former? where the number of *falſe* doctrines being *infinite*, and the *truth*, under each article being but *one*; I leave Mr. *Chandler* to amuſe himſelf with the calculation, what are the odds that the *one true* Scripture faith *prevails*, under *ſuch a ſcheme.*

HE ſays, that "without this latitude of prin-"ciple, he can ſee no poſſible end to the divi-"ſions of the Church [h]; " as if, *joining a crowd of people together*, would be *uniting Chriſtians*, properly ſo called.— Does Mr. *Chandler* think, that ſhutting a company of *Lutherans, Calviniſts, Papiſts, Socinians, Antinomians*, into *Weſtminſter-Abbey*, and bidding them there go and preach, each man his *reſpective doctrines*, as *ſcripture-faith*; does he

[h] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 40.

he think that this *latitude of principle* would put an end to their *diviſions ?* — Does not every man of common ſenſe ſee the contrary ? that it would be *authorizing them* to *keep up* thoſe *diviſions ?* — I ſuppoſe he thinks, that the permiſſion of this *latitude of principle*, would prevent them from *falling out:* But I think the contrary would be much more likely; the nearer ſuch a *rabble of teachers* were got together, the greater danger would there be of their *quarelling*; and, inſtead of *really uniting*, it would be ten to one but they *fell to loggerheads.* — Yet, " without this *latitude of* " *principle* (ſays Mr. *Chandler*) I can ſee no end to " the diviſions of the Church."— Surely he cannot ſay this gravely ! —I don't know Mr. *Chandler*'s private character; But I begin almoſt to ſuſpect him for a *Wag*, and that he is only *bantering* us all this while.—Without a *latitude of principle*, I can ſee no end of *diviſions*— *i. e.* the beſt way to prevent *diviſions*, is to admit *as many diviſions as poſſible.*—In order to promote *union*, get as many *differing* people together as you can; and, that you may have but *one true* ſyſtem of ſcripture faith taught in the Church; open the door, and if that is not wide enough, pull down the walls, and let in a *legion.*

Secondly. As another *Apoſtolical direction*, to the Governors of the Church in particular, expreſsly relating to the admiſſion of perſons to the miniſtry; I argued from 1 *Tim.* iii. 2. where one qualification, which St. *Paul* directs *Timothy* to have regard to in the ordination of a *Biſhop*, is, that he ſhould be διδακτικὸν, *skilful to teach, well inſtructed* in the true doctrine; from whence I inferr'd, that " *Timothy* muſt have thereby autho- " rity given him to *inquire* and *examine* (becauſe " he could not uſe any other human means to " know) whether he had this qualification or not.

" And ſince St. *Paul* would not have eſteemed " any one to have been διδακτικος, *well inſtructed* " in the doctrine of the Goſpel, who held do- " ctrines *contrary to* That of the Apoſtles; This " is another Apoſtolical direction to ordain none " to the office of a *Biſhop*, but ſuch who hold " the apoſtolic doctrine, that is, the doctrine of " the Church [i]" — Mr. *Chandler* aſks, " will " this gentleman ſeriouſly affirm, in the face of " the world, that the faith of every particular " Church, into which the candidates for the mi- " niſtry come to be admitted as Public Teachers, " is the apoſtolick doctrine [k]?"—I reply, that an apoſtolic direction to the Governors of the Church, to admit none to the office of the miniſtry, but thoſe who hold the *apoſtolic doctrine*; is, *conſequentially*, and *interpretatively*, an apoſtolical direction to admit none to that office, but thoſe who hold That which, to thoſe whoſe office it is to examine, *appears to be*, according to the beſt of their *judgment* and *conſcience*, the apoſtolic doctrine: And this I will *ſeriouſly affirm*, becauſe I can *ſeriouſly prove* it too: And if I prove *this*, I prove all that I have aſſerted, or that is contended for. All *miſtakes* in the *application*, flowing from *human fallibility*, which are alike incident to all human authority, invalidate not the *authority itſelf*.

AGAIN — I obſerved, that " one qualification " required in the *Deacons*, is, that they be ſuch as " hold the myſtery of the faith. 1 *Tim.* iii. 9. and that St. *Paul* directs *Timothy*, in ſo many " words, to *try* and *examine* them whether they " had it or not. Let theſe (ſays he) alſo firſt " δοκιμαζεσθωσαν, be *proved*, *tried*, or *examined* (or " if

[i] Church of *England* vind. p. 39.

[k] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 46.

" if it be rather thought to ſignify *approved*, it " will ſtill *preſuppoſe* all the former) *then*, εἶτα, " not before, let them uſe the office of a *Deacon*, " if they be found *blameleſs*, i. e. ſound in their " *faith* and *morals*, not otherwiſe. And, as one " qualification required in *Deacons*, was, *to hold* " *the myſtery of the faith*; it is plain, in particu- " lar, that *Timothy* was impower'd here to exa- " mine, and inquire into their *faith* [l]".— " I, " on the contrary (ſays Mr. *Chandler*) think 'tis " plain, from the whole context, that the proof " or examination here ſpoken of relates to their " *Morals*, and *not* to their *faith* [m]": that is, though St. *Paul* has *expreſsly* directed, that they ſhould be ſuch as *hold the myſtery of the faith*, and that they ſhould be *proved* or *examined*; yet Mr. *Chandler*, it ſeems, *thinks*, *on the contrary*, that this examination or tryal, relates *not* to their holding the myſtery of the *faith*. Why? Becauſe it is ſaid *alſo*, that they muſt be found *blameleſs*; and that they muſt hold this myſtery of the faith, *in a pure conſcience*; and, becauſe that by an examination into their *Morals* it only could be diſcovered whether they had this *pure conſcience* [n] — What! does it follow, that, becauſe they *are* to be examined whether they hold the *Myſtery of the faith* in a *pure conſcience*; therefore they are to be examined as to the purity of their *conſcience only*, and *not* to the *Myſtery of the faith*, though *both* are *equally mention'd* by the Apoſtle? The examination was to be, whether they *held the myſtery of the faith*, in a *pure conſcience*: But could it be diſcovered whether they held the *myſtery of the faith at all*, by examining *only* whether they had a *pure conſcience*, without

[l] Church of *England* vind. p. 40. 1 Tim. iii. 10.
[m] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 47.
[n] Vid. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 47.

without examining alſo whether they held the *myſtery of the faith*, as Mr. *Chandler* aſſerts?—"The "examination relates to their *Morals*, and *not* to "their faith."—The truth is, the examination here enjoined relates both to their *faith* and *morals*, as I had ſtated it; and which I believe nobody ever doubted of before.—But this is a ſpecimen of Mr. *Chandler* in his *critical capacity*.

But now at laſt, having *nibbled* a little at this text, he tells me (as he did once before upon a like occaſion) that *he will not diſpute this*.—"Let "the examination (ſays he) refer to their *faith*, as "well as *practice*, what will follow [o]?" Why, it will follow, as I argued, that "ſince St. *Paul* "would not have looked upon ſuch to *hold the* "*myſtery of the faith*, who held a faith *different* "from that which he and the other Apoſtles had "taught; therefore this is an apoſtolical direction "to admit none to the office of a *Deacon*, but "ſuch who held the faith of the Apoſtles, *i. e.* "the faith of the Church [p]" *i. e.* (quoth Mr. *Chandler*, with his uſual acuteneſs) "popery in "*Spain* and *Italy*, lutheraniſm in *Sweden* and "*Denmark*, calviniſm at *Geneva* and *Scotland*, "and arianiſm and ſocinianiſm, if ever any Church "ſhould happen to believe them [q]"; Which is ſtill only an objection drawn from *accidental events*, ariſing from the *application* of the Apoſtle's direction, in fallible men; which being the ſame in all caſes of human authority, prove nothing in the preſent quæſtion.

But he ſays, "he fancys he can make a better "inference from my premiſes."—What is it? Why, that "here is an apoſtolical direction to "admit

[o] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 47.
[p] Church of *England* vind. p. 40.
[q] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 47.

" admit none to the office of a *Deacon*, who hold " the faith of any particular Church, *if that faith* " *be contrary to the doctrine of the Apoſtles*; and " an Apoſtolical direction in particular to the " Governors of the Church, to examine the can- " didates for the miniſtry by nothing but *the faith* " *of the Apoſtles*; and by *no other kind of teſt* " *whatſoever*[r] "—And ſo Mr. *Chandler* thinks he has done the buſineſs! But, what if I ſhould aſk him, if they are to examine the candidates by *no other kind of teſt whatſoever* than the *mere words* of Scripture (for That is his meaning) how will they know, ſince *thoſe words* have *different* and *inconſiſtent ſenſes* affixed to them, whether the *faith* which the candidates hold, *be* contrary to the doctrine of the Apoſtles or *not?* — He ſays they are *not to be admitted*, if it be found that they hold a *faith contrary to the doctrine of the Apoſtles*. This overturns his *inference*, that the Apoſtle's direction, is to examine by *no other kind of teſt whatſoever* but by the *mere words of Scripture*; to which, all parties, and ſects of Chriſtians, will *equally aſſent*; and therefore here will be no room to *reject any of them*; and ſo his *better inference* would prove, that the Apoſtle had given a *direction* to *reject*, which could *never be put in practice*; and if Mr. *Chandler*'s method of examination (for he muſt excuſe me from calling it the *Apoſtle's*) will not introduce only *Popery* into one Church, *Lutheraniſm* into another, *Calviniſm* into a third, and *Arianiſm* or *Socinianiſm* into others; it will however, not *accidentally* but *neceſſarily*, introduce *Popery*, *Lutheraniſm*, *Calviniſm*, *Arianiſm*, *Socinianiſm*, and a tribe of ten thouſand other *contradictory doctrines* into *one and the ſame* Church — in which Mr. *Chandler* ſees no abſurdity at all—— He aſks, " would

[r] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 48.

" would any beſides ſuch *acute Divines* as Mr. " *White*, and his fellow-labourer the *Champion*, " ever argue, that becauſe Deacons muſt hold " the myſtery of the faith in Chriſt, they muſt " therefore hold the myſteries of the faith in the " *Church of Rome*[2]?"—— It has been ſhewn, that neither Mr. *White* nor his fellow-labourer reaſon in any ſuch manner; But it has been ſhewn too, that Mr. *Chandler* (as *acute* a reaſoner as he is) cannot avoid this very conſequence. For, if All, *without exception of any denomination or party of Chriſtians whatſoever*, are to be *received into the miniſtry*, in Mr. *Chandler*'s all-comprehenſive Church, upon the broad-bottom ſcheme of examination by aſſent to the *mere words* of Scripture; and if *Papiſts*, as well as others, will aſſent to the *mere words* of Scripture; the neceſſary, and unavoidable conſequence is, that *Papiſts* muſt be admitted among the reſt— And as This will, I ſuppoſe, be eſteemed to *fill up the meaſure* of abſurdity in his ſcheme; ſo it will, at the ſame time, be thought to render it *ripe to its ruin* too— not to be prevented, by all the *rotten props* which Mr. *Chandler*, and his fellow-labourer the *Old Whig*, can drag to its ſupport——And therefore, when, in the ſame page, he ſays that *we* " cor- " rupt, *interpolate*, *mangle*, and pervert theſe " Apoſtolical injunctions, and introduce a rule " of judging of *miniſterial qualifications*, that may " be, and in the nature of the thing frequently " muſt be, the deſtruction of Chriſt's doctrine, " and the means of introducing *every kind* of er- " ror and hereſy into the Chriſtian Church;" he ſhould here have recollected himſelf, and told his friend that he had *forgot himſelf* again; and that all

[2] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 48.

all this is applicable, with much greater truth and propriety, to his *own ſcheme*.

"THE rule (he tells us) is certain and evident, "if men will ſee it, *viz. their conſenting to the "wholeſome words of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the "doctrine according to godlineſs*, or *holding faſt the "form of ſound words in faith and love, delivered "by the Apoſtle*[t]". And this, I ſuppoſe, is to be an argument, if Mr. *Chandler* can get any body to *ſee it*, that the Apoſtle's rule of *examination*, is only to *hold faſt* the *mere words* of Scripture; though the perſons examined, when they aſſent to them, underſtand them in ever ſo many *different* and *contradictory ſenſes*; that is, that they are to *hold faſt* (as they have been made) the *wind* of doctrine only, without inquiring any thing as to the *doctrines themſelves contained* in *thoſe words*; which is to make the Apoſtle author of ſuch a rule of examination, as no one, except Mr. *Chandler*, would look upon to be *any examination at all*.

"*Timothy* (he ſays) had no power and autho-"rity to vary from this form of tryal[u];" *viz.* whether the candidates conſent to the *wholeſome words of* Chriſt, and the *doctrine according* to *godlineſs*, the *form of ſound words*, &c. No; nor is taking the *beſt method* to *render it effectual*, and of any uſe, *varying* from it— To uſe, in ſuch a caſe, *Scripture-words* only, when the candidates make uſe of them in very *different* ſenſes, would really be *varying* from the rule of examining whether they held the *doctrine according to godlineſs*; and the true way of keeping to the rule, is to guard againſt *prevarication*; by not taking an aſſent, from the candidates, to *mere words*, inſtead

[t] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 49.
[u] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 49.

of an explicite aſſent to the *doctrines* contained in them.

But, not to examine by *mere Scripture-words* is, he ſays, to "go beyond the ſtandard and teſt, "in things of pure revelation [x]"—But Scripture, by this method, would be made no *ſtandard* at all. What are *Scripture-words* to be the *ſtandard* of? of *doctrines?* yes, when thoſe words are rightly underſtood, and ſome *determinate ſenſe* affixed to them: But, without that, they are no *ſtandard* to *meaſure* any thing by, except it be *letters* and *ſyllables*; any more than a *foot* would be the *ſtandard* for twenty different men to *meaſure* by, while each man underſtood it to contain a *different number of inches*; And 'tis *they* "miniſter quæſtions "and ſtrifes of words, which have little or no "tendency to godlineſs [y]," who inſiſt, and contend ſo much for the *mere words* of Scripture only, without concerning themſelves about the *godlineſs* or the *doctrines* they contain.

Mr. *Chandler* next ſpends ſix or ſeven pages, in endeavouring to prove, that it is *eſſential* to the Scripture-notion of an *heretic*, in the criminal ſenſe of it, that he be a *corrupt, profligate* man, *openly known* to be ſuch; and that ſuch are the only *Scripture-heretics* which Church-Governors have any authority from *Tit.* iii. 10. to *reject*. — What he ſays, is very far from *proving* any thing about it—mere random concluſions, from arbitrary premiſes — "A heretic "(ſays he) is one who voluntarily ſeparates from "the Church, *&c.* and who holds opinions diffe-"rent from, and repugnant to the Chriſtian "faith."—very well—But now he runs away too faſt —— "And as ſuch a ſeparation from the "Chriſtian Church muſt be the effect of ſome "very

[x] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 49.
[y] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 49.

" very corrupt paſſions and affections, and to " promote ſome very bad purpoſes and views; " hence 'tis *eſſential* to the notion of a *heretic* in " Scripture, in the *criminal* ſenſe of it, that he be " a *corrupt*, *profligate*, *wicked* man, *openly known* to " be ſuch; ſeparating from the Church, and ſpread- " ing his own wicked principles, the better to " promote and carry on his ſelfiſh, baſe, and evil " intentions [z]."—*Hence* 'tis eſſential to the notion of an heretic, *&c.* *Whence* does all this appear to be eſſential?—Why, becauſe Mr. *Chandler* has taken upon him to *aſſert*, without offering at any kind of *proof*, that every one who ſeparates from the Church, and holds opinions repugnant to the Chriſtian faith, *muſt* do this from ſome *very corrupt paſſions and affections*, and to promote ſome very bad purpoſes and views, i. e. *knowing them to be ſuch*: For Mr. *Chandler* ſays, he muſt be ſuch an one as is *ſelf-condemned*, which he explains to be, " condemned by his *own conſcience*, as eve- " ry *bad man* is, who ever gives himſelf leave to " reflect; *conſcious to himſelf* that he acts *contrary* " to his *obligations* and duty [a]".— But is all this ſelf-evident, or to be taken upon Mr. *Chandler*'s word? And is his *extenſive Charity* at laſt *contracted* into theſe *narrow principles?*—I aſſure him, my notions of men and things are not ſo *confined*—— For I muſt own, that I cannot conceive the impoſſibility that a man may, through *miſtake* and *miſunderſtanding* ſcripture, or through the *fallibility* and *weakneſs* of *human reaſon*, be led to hold opinions which may in reality, either immediately, or conſequentially, be repugnant to the true Chriſtian faith.— But this, which *may* be the effect merely of the *fallibility* of *human reaſon*, Mr. *Chand-*

[z] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 51.

[a] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 51.

ler affirms *muſt* be the effect of *corrupt paſſions* and *affections*; and *hence* 'tis eſſential to an heretic to be a *ſelfiſh*, *baſe*, *corrupt*, *profligate* man——I give this only as a ſpecimen of Mr. *Chandler*'s manner of *reaſoning*.— As to the quæſtion, concerning the *Scripture-notion* of an *heretic*, and *who are ſuch*, in reſpect to the purpoſes of *Church-diſcipline*; 'tis an old ſtory. The controverſy was exhauſted ſome years ſince, between Dr. *Stebbing* and Mr. *Foſter*; when, after the matter had been fully and thoroughly debated in ſix or ſeven pamphlets, for near *two years* together; Dr. *Stebbing* proſecuting the ſubject with learning and judgment, as long as there was any thing *of conſequence* remaining to be ſaid, ſufficient for a *fourpenny pamphlet*; and Mr. *Foſter*, when *he could ſay nothing*, reſolving (as is commonly the caſe) to *have the laſt word*, was at length driven into a *news-paper*, and made his *exit* on *Thurſday*, the 17*th day of March*, *one thouſand ſeven hundred and thirty ſix*, in the *Old Whig*—the *common-ſhore*, into which all the *dirty calumny* from all quarters, againſt the Church and Clergy, for ſome time, diſembogued itſelf. —I ſhall therefore trouble the reader with nothing farther on this head, but think it ſufficient to refer.

Now, from theſe *general apoſtolical directions*; to *commit the doctrine* to ſuch men only who were *well inſtructed*, were *fit*, *skilful*, and *duly qualified* to *teach* the *true Chriſtian doctrine*; to *ſearch*, *inquire*, and *avoid* thoſe who *cauſe diviſions and offences contrary to the true doctrine*; to *prove*, *try*, and *examine* the *candidates for the miniſtry*, whether they *held the myſtery of the faith*; my argument proceded, that "therefore, though the Apoſtles "have not ſaid in ſo many words, that the Go-"vernors of the Church ſhall require ſubſcription "to a ſet of explanatory articles; yet we have "from the Apoſtles, notwithſtanding, ſufficient "autho-

" authority for ſuch practice. For the order to " examine, and prove, is *general*, and the *means* " left, as they always muſt be, to the *diſcretion* of " thoſe who are to *exerciſe* ſuch authority; ſince " the *means* and methods of diſcovering who are " ſound in the faith, and who are not ſo, muſt " alter as *times* and *circumſtances* alter, as hereſies " are *fewer* or more *numerous*, as the cunning " craft of men makes it *proportionably* more or leſs " difficult to *diſcover* their *real ſentiments* [b] ". —— One would think there is nothing in this reaſoning, but what is agreeable to ſenſe and truth; yet Mr. *Chandler* thinks it ſufficient to paſs it off in that *eaſy manner*, that " the only argument I " attempt to produce for this authority, is, that " becauſe the Apoſtles command *one* thing, they " have given us authority to do *another* [c] ". But I ſhall not part with him ſo: For it is true, and a good argument in a thouſand inſtances, that a *command* to do *one thing*, may *include* an *authority* to do *another*. — Does not a command to do *any thing* where the *means* are left *undetermined*, or *not expreſſed* (whether they are, or are not ſo in the preſent caſe, is another quæſtion, and will preſently come under examination) include an *authority* to make uſe of the *beſt means* to execute that command? But he would have the reader underſtand, by *another*, ſomething *inconſiſtent with*, or *contradictory to* the *one* thing commanded: But then, beſides that he is fallaciouſly *playing upon words*, his aſſertion will not be *true*, *viz.* " that " the argument I uſe, to prove the apoſtolical " authority in the preſent caſe, is, that *becauſe the* " *Apoſtles have commanded one thing, they have* " *given authority to do another*:" For, the *other* thing will

[b] Church of *England* vind. p. 41.
[c] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 58.

will appear, in the courſe of this debate, to be only the *particular means* of performing the *thing commanded* in *general*, to the *beſt advantage*; and therefore, unleſs he can prove (which we ſhall find he cannot) that theſe *means* are *inconſiſtent with*, or *contrary to* the *general command*, he will ſay nothing. If, on the contrary, it ſhall appear, that an explanatory inquiry is not only the *beſt*, but the *neceſſary means* of performing theſe *general commands*, to any purpoſe at all; then my argument, for the apoſtolical authority claimed, is not to be overturned by better arguments than Mr. *Chandler* has brought againſt it.

Now then let us attend to Mr. *Chandler*'s *judgment*, which, he ſays, he *muſt be excuſed if he paſſes on this part of the* controverſy, *and affirms* (which, generally ſpeaking, is all the *reaſon* he will afford us) "that Chriſt and his Apoſtles have given, "neither in expreſs terms, nor by any fair im- "plication, deduction, or conſequence, any pow- "er, or *ſhadow of power*, to the Church, or Go- "vernors of it, to try the faith of any perſons "whatſoever by *articles of their own making*, or by "any other kind of teſts and ſtandards of ortho- "doxy, but the holy Scriptures [d]"—*Articles of their own making!* another ambiguity! Does he mean articles of *faith* of their *own making*, ſuch as are not *Scripture-faith?* Who ever contended for examination by *ſuch articles?* Yet this is the only ſenſe in which he will be able to maintain his *affirmation:* For if he means, that no authority can be deduced from Scripture, by any fair implication, or conſequence (for thoſe who are commanded to examine the candidates for the miniſtry, whether they hold the Scripture-doctrine) to examine by articles compoſed in *words explanatory* of

[d] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 58.

of *Scripture-words*, when the *uſe* of ſuch *Scripture-words only* (having had *different* and *inconſiſtent ſenſes* and *meanings* affixed to them) becomes inſufficient to *diſcover* whether the candidates *do* or *do not* hold the *Scripture-doctrine*, which is what, by ſuppoſition, they are to inquire about; If *this* be the meaning of his *affirmation*, he is a bolder man (not than I thought him, but) than his abilities will juſtify; and the proof of the contrary truth has been ſufficiently made good.

THUS again he ſays, that there is no power given to try the faith of any perſons whatever "by any other ſtandards of orthodoxy, but the "holy Scriptures; which to all Chriſtians, and "in all controverſies of faith and doctrine, is [are] "and ſhould be, the ſole *authoritative authentick* "*judge*, by which alone all quæſtions of this na-"ture ſhould be determined and decided[e]".— True: But this does not interfere with the authority contended for—Scripture ſtill remains the *ſtandard of orthodoxy*, the ſole *authoritative*, *authentic judge*, by which all quæſtions of this nature, and by which the doctrines of all explanatory articles themſelves, are to be decided.—But how does he make out his conſequence; that *therefore* explanatory articles can in no caſe be lawfully uſed?— Inſtead of *haranguing*, and *declaiming* upon every topic; let me ſee the quæſtion *logically*, *rationally* argued. — Let him prove, by due force of argument, that *if* the Scriptures be, in the laſt reſult, the *ſtandard of orthodoxy*, and the only *authoritative*, *authentic judge* of all matters of faith; *then* and *therefore*, the Governors of the Church, who are commanded to try and examine the candidates for the miniſtry, are obliged (as a *neceſſary conſequence* from *this propoſition*, *viz.* that *Scripture is*

[e] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 58.

is the ſtandard of orthodoxy, the ſole authoritative judge in matters of faith) to make this tryal *ſolely*, and *merely* by the *words* of Scripture; when, by having had *different ſenſes* affixed to them, it is become *impoſſible to diſcover*, by the uſe of theſe *Scripture-words only*, whether the candidates hold the *Scripture-doctrine*. — When he has fairly proved *this conſequence*, from *thoſe premiſes*, he will then have a right to call what he has given us, an *argument*; which, 'till then, *I muſt be excuſed if I paſs my judgment* upon it, and call it only a little *popular preaching*, and a conſequence *of his own making*.

But (ſays he) "the moſt certain inference from "hence, is"— from whence? from Scripture being the *ſole authoritative, authentic judge* in matters of faith. Well; what is the moſt certain inference from hence? Why, "that as to what this "rule hath left *undecided*, every Chriſtian ſhould "be left to *his own ſenſe*, and the peaceable poſ-"ſeſſion of *his private ſentiments*; and that none "have any right herein to *dictate* to *his conſci-"ence*, or make any *authoritative deciſion* for "him[f]".—And this *moſt certain inference*, might moſt certainly as well have been kept to himſelf, for any good it does in the controverſy between him and me. — As to what Scripture has left *undecided*, I am ready to agree with him, that every Chriſtian ſhould be left to his *own ſenſe*, and the *peaceable poſſeſſion* of his *private ſentiments*.

But give me leave to aſk, how we are to determine when Scripture *has*, and when it has *not*, left a doctrine undecided? This depends upon men's *agreeing* upon the *one*, only, true, and *genuine ſenſe* of *Scripture-words*. In ſuch caſes, where there is *this agreement*, there will be no occaſion for

[f] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 58.

for any contention about a right of *private judgment*, and the *peaceable poſſeſſion* of our *private ſentiments*; becauſe every man's *private ſentiments* will be *the ſame*, and the ſame with the *public ſentiments*; and no room for any one's *peaceable poſſeſſion* to be diſturbed: But if, in many caſes, different ſects and parties of Chriſtians, have contended for their reſpective different and inconſiſtent ſenſes, and meanings of Scripture-words; I doubt we ſhall not find it ſo eaſy to *agree* about what Scripture, in ſuch caſes, *has*, or has *not*, left *undecided*; which yet Mr. *Chandler* takes here for granted to be, in all inſtances, a *well known thing*.—Have not I as much a right to ſay of a doctrine, that Scripture *has not* left it undecided; as Mr. *Chandler* has to ſay, that Scripture *has* left it ſo? And yet, 'till this *previous quæſtion* be determined, we are but where we were; and Mr. *Chandler*'s *moſt certain inference*, that "as to what Scripture has "left undecided, every Chriſtian ſhould be left "to his *own ſenſe*;" though very true, will be of no uſe in practice.

But, as for myſelf, I will readily admit more than Mr. *Chandler*, by his reſtrictive clauſe, requires: For, ſuppoſing Scripture to have really left *nothing undecided*; I ſhall never contend, that, as to matters of faith, any man's *conſcience* ſhould be *dictated to*, any *authoritative deciſion* made for him, in caſes where he is not ſatisfied that Scripture *has decided* the matter, or may think it has decided for him. Every man ought to be left, in ſuch caſes, in the *peaceable poſſeſſion* of his *conſcience*, and *private ſentiments*.—The *right of private judgment*, ſincerely and conſcientiouſly uſed, I would, as ſtrenuouſly as Mr. *Chandler*, maintain againſt all unjuſt impoſition, or oppoſition, *from whatever quarter it may come*.—But, in the preſent caſe of examining the candidates for the miniſtry by *explanatory*

natory articles, I really cannot find out any *dictating to their conſcience*, any *authoritative deciſion made for them*; or that they are not ſtill left in the *peaceable poſſeſſion* of their *private ſentiments*—The *authoritative deciſion* in *explanatory articles*, is only as to the faith and opinions of the *Church*—To the *candidates*, they are only a *teſt*, or *inquiry* to *diſcover what* their private ſentiments are; what deciſion they have *already made for themſelves*; and whoever claim a right to be admitted as Public Teachers, without making ſuch a diſcovery, *i. e.* a right to teach publicly whatever doctrines and opinions they pleaſe, as Scripture-doctrine, tho' ever ſo contradictory to the doctrines of that Church into which they claim ſuch admiſſion; *they* are the men who thus intrude upon the *liberty* of that *Church* and *ſociety of Chriſtians*; demand a right of *diſturbing* them in the *peaceable poſſeſſion* of their *ſentiments*; *dictate* to *their conſcience* whom they ought to admit to, and whom reject from the office of Public Teachers; and make an *arbitrary deciſion for them*, how they ſhall interpret Scripture, and underſtand the apoſtolical injunctions.

I SHALL therefore take the liberty here of telling Mr. *Chandler*, what I before told the *old whig*, that he ought to know, that, as every man's own judgment and conſcience, is to him the rule of his own faith and conduct, in the due diſcharge of any office and truſt committed to him; ſo the *judgment* and *conſcience* of the *Church*, and Governors therein, are to *them* the *rule* of *their* own faith and conduct, in the like diſcharge of *their truſts*; that the Governors therefore in every diviſion of the Chriſtian Church, to whom the *important truſt* is committed of *ordaining Public Teachers* in it, muſt conduct themſelves, in the *diſcharge* of *this truſt*, by the *rule* of *their own judgment and conſcience*; which is, and ought to be allowed the rule to *them*,

as

as well as to Mr. *Chandler*, and the *old whig*.[g] Theſe gentlemen therefore, are *themſelves guilty* of the *very crime* of which *they accuſe the Church*. They are *invading the liberty* of a *whole body*; *impoſing their ſchemes of government* upon it; demanding them to deliver up their judgment and their conſcience to *their direction*; and, while loudly pleading for their *own freedom*, are for *taking others by the throat*, and *fettering* them at diſcretion.

" If (ſays Mr. *Chandler*) the Clergy's *explana-*
" *tory articles* of faith, and the enforcing ſubſcrip-
" tions to them had been a more proper teſt,
" than the words and doctrine of Scripture itſelf,
" we ſhould have had plain directions on this
" head to *Timothy* and *Titus*, amongſt the other
" advices that the Apoſtle gave them; and
" he would not have left a matter of ſuch conſe-
" quence merely to the determinations of *human*
" *prudence*, *&c.*[h] "—Will he venture to ſtand by this kind of argument?—that the *particular means* of performing all the *apoſtolical directions*, are *always ſpecified* in Scripture?—If he will, I may turn his own artillery upon him; and, upon the credit of this argument (as far as it will go) may tell him, that if always keeping to the *mere words* of Scripture only, in all times and circumſtances of the Church, though *thoſe words* ſhould be made uſe of in very *different* and *contradictory ſenſes*, was the *ſole* and *invariable method* intended by the *Apoſtles* for *examining* the *candidates for the miniſtry* (as Mr. *Chandler* pretends it was) then we ſhould have had *this method* particularly and explicitly *ſpecified* to *Timothy* and *Titus*.—But This is really deſcending ſo low, to the *very dregs* of reaſoning, that I ſhall leave Mr. *Chandler* in the *peaceable poſſeſſion* of this

[g] *Vid.* Church of *England* vindicated, p. 13.
[h] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 59.

private ſentiment.—But I cannot help juſt pointing out to the reader, once for all, Mr. *Chandler*'s jumbling together here, as in other places, *Scripture-words* and *Scripture-doctrine*; as if, becauſe *Scripture-doctrine* is the *teſt of faith*, therefore the *uſe* of *Scripture-words* only muſt always be ſo too; and his charging the church with *enforcing* ſubſcription, and yet calling it a *teſt*, which nothing *enforced* can ever be; and therefore ſhews, that, as it really is offered as a *teſt*, it cannot be *enforced*—I really wiſh Mr. *Chandler* would learn a little to *ſeparate his Ideas*; he would come much better prepared for controverſy, and would have this farther advantage by it, that they would appear to be *more in number*, than at preſent they ſeem to be.

FROM the *general apoſtolical directions* I farther argued, that, "ſince theſe are all *general rules* "which are *ordered to be obſerved by the Church*, "and the *particular methods* of doing this left *un*"*determined*; and ſince it is yet *neceſſary* that "they *ſhould be* determined, in order to obtain the "end which the Apoſtles deſigned; it follows, that "there is *authority in the Church* to determine ſuch "methods[i]." To this Mr. *Chandler* roundly anſwers, that "the *aſſertion itſelf*, that the *parti*"*cular methods* of doing this are left *undetermined*, "is *abſolutely groundleſs*; and I am ſorry (ſays he) "Mr. *White* and his *fellow labourer* are *ſo ill ac*"*quainted with their Bibles*, as to venture to af"firm any ſuch thing[k]".—To paſs by ill manners with the contempt it deſerves, let us hear how he makes this out.

"My *New Teſtament*."—Aye, let us ſee what Mr. *Chandler*'s *New Teſtament* ſays--Why, "my *New* "*Teſtament* moſt certainly and *expreſsly determines* "the

[i] Church of *England* vindicated, p. 34.
[k] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 61.

" the rule of tryal, and lays one down of perpe-
" tual obligation in the Chriſtian Church, that is
" to *ſuperſede* all other rules and forms what-
" ever;" and this rule is—you ſhall ſee what—
" *ſearch the Scriptures. Theſe are they which*
" *teſtify of me*, was the language of One, who
" ſhould beſt know the propereſt method of deter-
" mining all queſtions relating to his own perſon
" and doctrine[1]." Mr. *Chandler* is a little unlucky here, in citing theſe words as the *propereſt method of determining all quæſtions relating to Chriſt's perſon and doctrine.* He ſhould have recollected, that this direction to *ſearch the Scriptures* (*John* v. 39.) though laid down in the *New Teſtament*, relates to the Scriptures of the *Old* Teſtament; and it was very proper for our Lord to ſend the *Jews*, who believed not on him, to the *Old Teſtament*, whoſe *divine authority* they acknowledged; as what *teſtified of him:* But ſurely, the Scriptures of the *Old Teſtament* are not *now* the *propereſt method* of determining *all* quæſtions relating to *Chriſt's perſon and doctrine:* yet, according to Mr. *Chandler*'s repreſentation of the matter, our Lord ſends all Chriſtians *now*, to the Scriptures of the *Old Teſtament* as the *propereſt method* of determining *all* quæſtions relating to *his perſon and doctrine.*—I ſay *all Chriſtians now*; For Mr. *Chandler* has precluded his retreat, that he meant this as given only to the *Jews*; by having cited the direction as given here to be of *perpetual obligation* in the *Chriſtian Church.*—If he meant to have the words, *ſearch the Scriptures*, underſtood *in general*, to be the *propereſt method of determining all quæſtions of faith*, without regarding the *particular meaning* of them, as they ſtand in the place from whence he has cited them; then I ſay he was *unlucky*, in happening to cite words which had

a

[1] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 61.

a *very particular meaning*, when he might have cited ſo many other *general ones*; and in repreſenting it as given for a *perpetual rule* in the *Chriſtian Church*, that to ſearch the *Old Teſtament* is the *propereſt method* of determining *all* quæſtions about *Chriſt's perſon and doctrine*.—This is the *accuracy* of one, who pities Mr. *White* and myſelf for being *ill acquainted with our Bibles*.—It ſhews that he *quotes* in the ſame *random manner* that he *reaſons*; which was all I intended by this remark.

LET us take theſe words, *ſearch the Scriptures*, as detached from their proper place and occaſion, and underſtand them as a *general direction* relating to *both Teſtaments*—and what then?—why then, this is the "propereſt method of determining all "queſtions relating to the perſon and doctrine of "Chriſt."—Who diſputes it? But how does he prove, what he muſt prove if he proves any thing to the purpoſe, that this direction, to *ſearch the Scriptures*, is an *excluſive* rule *ſuperſeding* all *explanatory inquiry* in regard to the *candidates for the miniſtry*?—Does a direction to *ſearch the Scriptures*, as the rule of determining all quæſtions of faith and doctrine, prove that an examination by Scripture-*words only*, is *ſufficient to diſcover* whether they hold the true *doctrine contained* in *thoſe Scriptures*, which we are directed to ſearch into? Suppoſe the quæſtions ariſe from the *different meanings* and *ſenſes* in which *Scripture-words* are uſed; the determination of *ſuch quæſtions* will then depend upon the true *meaning* of thoſe *Scripture-words*: I would therefore deſire him to inform me, how a direction to *ſearch the Scriptures*, can be a rule of determining *all* quæſtions of faith; quæſtions which ariſe about the *very meaning* of *Scripture-words*; if it be ſuch a rule, as Mr. *Chandler* pretends it is, as *excludes* and *ſuperſedes* all *explanatory inquiry* into the *meaning* of *thoſe words*?—But Theſe are *inconſiſtences*

ſiſtences which, I fancy, will require more *critical art* to reconcile, than Mr. *Chandler* appears to be maſter of.

THE reſt of the quotations from Mr. *Chandler*'s *New Teſtament* are much of a piece.—*If ye continue in my word, then are ye my diſciples indeed.—He that receiveth not my words hath one that judgeth him*[m]—with more to the ſame purpoſe, about *keeping Chriſt's words*, *keeping Chriſt's ſayings*, and the like. Upon which he obſerves, "If I underſtand theſe expreſſions, and others like them "might be mentioned" (aye, five hundred) "the meaning of them is; that continuance in "the words or *doctrines of Chriſt*, *thoſe words "which he ſpoke*, and which he received from his "Father, and gave to his diſciples, and the receiving and keeping theſe *words*, is the true "characteriſtick of a Chriſtian; the only ſure method of underſtanding and knowing *his truth*, "of eſcaping the condemnation of God, and manifeſting our affection and duty to Chriſt: *i. e.* "Chriſt's *word* is the *only teſt of truth*, and 'tis "the duty and honour of Apoſtles, Miniſters, "and all Chriſtians, to abide by and adhere to "it[n]."—Does any man deny this? ſurely Mr. *Chandler* cannot mean (though I don't know but he may, for we have had arguments from him of the ſame ſize) that the repetition of *the words*, and *the ſayings* here, are to ſtand for a proof that Scripture has injoined hereby the Governors of the Church, to examine the candidates for the miniſtry by the *mere words* of Scripture only——And yet, unleſs the paſſages he has produced prove this, they prove nothing againſt me.—The *words* here, the λογοι, the ρηματα, ſignify no more than

[m] John viii. 31. xii. 48.
[n] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 62.

than the *doctrines*. *Chriſt's words*, and *Chriſt's ſayings* here, are Chriſt's *doctrines*: And becauſe a continuance in the *doctrines* of Chriſt, the *receiving* and *keeping* his *doctrines*, be the *true characteriſtic of a Chriſtian*, and the *only ſure method of underſtanding and knowing his truth*; Though Chriſt's *doctrine* be the only *teſt of truth*, and the *duty and honour of Apoſtles, Miniſters, and all Chriſtians*, be to *abide by, and adhere* to Chriſt's *doctrine*; By what rule in Mr. *Chandler*'s logic does it follow, that *therefore* the uſe of the *mere words* of Scripture by the candidates for the miniſtry, are ſufficient to *diſcover* in *what ſenſe* they *uſe thoſe words*; and *what doctrine* they underſtand to be *contained in them*, when they have been ſo *differently underſtood?* And if the uſe of the *mere words* of Scripture will not *diſcover* this, how then are they *tried*, or *examined* by them, whether they hold the *doctrine* of Chriſt; which is allowed to be the *qualification neceſſary* for their *admiſſion*, and concerning which the *tryal* is to be made, if it is to be a tryal of any *ſignificancy?*

Of the like force are all his other quotations of Scripture-texts; of *conſenting to the wholeſome words of Chriſt*; of *obeying the pattern of doctrine*; of *preaching no other Goſpel*; of *holding faſt the form of ſound words*, the *good depoſit of ſound words*, the *faithful-word*, and the like: All which, 'till Mr. *Chandler* has contrived ſome rule of criticiſm, to fix down the ſenſe of *holding faſt the form of ſound words*, to ſignify that the Governors of the Church are hereby limited *ſo* to hold faſt the form of ſound words, that, in examining candidates for the office of the miniſtry, they are never to make uſe of any *other* words than the *mere words* of Scripture, though ever ſo differently underſtood—'till Mr. *Chandler* has *fairly proved this* to be the *meaning* of *holding faſt the form of ſound words*, or to be a

neceſſary

neceſſary conſequence from this direction; he may indeed *repeat* theſe, and a hundred other paſſages of Scripture of the like import, and may tell us that *his* New Teſtament *expreſsly determines the rule of tryal*—And when he has done, he may repeat too, if he pleaſes, the *firſt chapter of Geneſis*, which will be juſt of as much ſervice to him as the other.

BUT let us attend him in the progreſs of his argument—"According to theſe apoſtolical con-"ſtitutions, there was a form, τυπος, a model, "or pattern of doctrine—This model of doctrine "was *compleat*, from which there was to be no "variation—*Timothy* and *Titus* were to adhere to "it—The Biſhops and Church-Governors were "to hold it faſt"—To what end? Mr. *Chandler* ſhall tell you in his own words—"that by the "*ſound doctrine* contained in this form, they "might effectually *exhort and convince gain-ſay-"ers*[o]."—Well; and might they not keep to the *ſound doctrine*, contained in this form, without always keeping to the *very words* of it? They were to *exhort and convince gain-ſayers*, by the *ſound doctrine* contained in this form. The *doctrine* was what they were thus injoined to *hold faſt*. This was the *form*, the τυπος, the *model* they were to *adhere to*, and from which there was to be *no variation*; and when Mr. *Chandler* has proved, on the contrary, that the τυπος ſignifies the exact *letters* and *ſyllables* of Scripture; and that theſe texts injoin, that, in the examination of the candidates for the miniſtry, there ſhall be *no variation* from *theſe letters and ſyllables*; they will then, and not 'till then, be of ſervice to him in the preſent quæſtion—Mr. *Chandler* ſays, that *Timothy* was to charge others not to *contend about words, as a thing*

 profitable

[o] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 64.

profitable for nothing—This is againſt him; For ſurely *they* moſt contend about *words*, neglecting the *thing*, who inſiſt ſo ſtrenuouſly for the neceſſity of uſing Scripture-*words* only, even in caſes where the uſe of them is become *ambiguous*; not *they* who contend, not about the *mere words*, but about the *ſenſe* and *doctrine* of Scripture—'Tis Mr. *Chandler* therefore who falls under the cenſure of *contending about words*; and all his arguments, as they center in this, ſo the reader will find them to be accordingly—*profitable for nothing*. Was *Titus*, or the Biſhops he was to ordain, tied up to exhort and convince gain-ſayers by the *mere words* of Scripture only; becauſe they were to *hold faſt the faithful word*, and exhort and convince them by ſound *doctrine?* What if they found, that theſe *gain-ſayers*, though they received the *literal form* of doctrine, the *Scripture-words*; yet rejected the ſound *doctrine* really contained in thoſe words; and ſo held the *form* without the true *power* of them, the *ſhadow* without the *ſubſtance?*—How was *Titus*, in this caſe, or the Biſhops, to exhort and *convince* theſe *gain-ſayers?* Why, according to Mr. *Chandler*, they were only to keep continually *repeating* the *mere words* of Scripture; thoſe very words, and *no other*, which yet they knew theſe *gain-ſayers* readily aſſented to from the very firſt, and would do ſo to the very laſt, without being at all the more *convinced* of the *ſound doctrine* contained therein; 'till they were farther convinced of the *true meaning* and *ſenſe* of thoſe words; which if Mr. *Chandler* can find out the ſecret of doing, by repeating over only the *ſame Scripture-words*, and *no other*; he will ſhew himſelf a much greater genius, than at preſent I take him to be. This is a method of *convincing*, which Mr. *Chandler*, 'tis likely, would make uſe of; But which, I believe, neither *Titus* nor St. *Paul* ever dream'd of.

BUT now for a daſh of *criticiſm*—" τυπωσις, " (ſays he) ſignifies a ſhort, compendious, plain, " and perſpicuous ſummary of things, in oppoſi- " tion to a prolix and more explicit and particular " account of them, and thus it well anſwers to " the word τυπος, the platform or model of doc- " trine, which was to be the rule and ſtandard, " with which every thing taught in the Chriſtian " Church was to be compared, and by which it " was to be judged of and determined [p]."—But notwithſtanding this τυπωσις was originally ever ſo plain and perſpicuous, before men had corrupted it; yet, when various and contradictory ſenſes and meanings, ſignifying different and contradictory doctrines, have been put upon the *words* of this τυπωσις; it muſt thereby be rendered *uncertain*, in *which* of theſe ſenſes and doctrines, any perſon uſes the words of it, while he keeps to the *mere words only*, and refuſes all explanatory inquiry, as Mr. *Chandler* adviſes him to do; for the Governors of the Church, it ſeems, are never to go beyond the *letters* and *ſyllables* of this τυπωσις; they have authority to examine the candidates for the miniſtry by *theſe words only*, and by *no other*; and all this, becauſe " τυπωσις " ſignifies a plain ſummary of things, by which " every doctrine was to be judged of, and is a " perpetual rule of judging concerning the ſound- " neſs of all men's ſentiments in the faith of " Chriſt [q]." *i. e. Becauſe* the *ſound* doctrine of Chriſt, is really *contained* in certain words, which have had alſo *unſound* ſenſes, expreſſive of *unſound* doctrine put upon them; *therefore*, the uſe of *thoſe words alone*, is a *ſufficient teſt*, whether the perſon who uſes *them alone*, holds the *true* or the *falſe*, the *ſound* or the *unſound* doctrine, *contained* in them—

[p] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 65. [q] Ibid. p. 65.

them—Here again are *premiſes* and *conſequences* for you!—But ſince 'tis a pity that all this learning and criticiſm, about ὑποτυπωσις and τυπος, ſhould be thrown away; I ſhall borrow it of Mr. *Chandler* for a moment; and obſerve, that, ſince this form of ſound words, this *model* and *platform* of doctrine, was (as Mr. *Chandler* ſays) a *ſhort, compendious ſummary of things*; it muſt, from the nature of it, when *corrupted* and *perverted* to make it teach *different* doctrines, not only admit of, but *require* the *more explication*, and render an *explicite inquiry* in what ſenſe the candidates for the miniſtry underſtand it, the more neceſſary. But he goes on ſtill in the *ſame ſtrain*, repeating over and over the ſame things, and to as little purpoſe.—He ſays, that "St. *Paul* has given us an *exceeding particular* rule, about preſerving the purity of the faith." And what is it? Why, the old rule, of "*holding faſt the faithful word*[r]." *i. e.* the *general rule* to do a thing, and the *means how*, and in what *method* it is to be done, are, with Mr. *Chandler*, *one and the ſame thing*.—The direction to *hold faſt the faithful word*, is the ſame, and no more, than to *preſerve the purity of the faith*; and they are both equally, and no more than, *general rules:* But all this while, *how* is this to be done? *how* are we to *preſerve the purity of the faith?* Why, Mr. *Chandler* tells you, by *holding faſt the faithful word, i. e.* by *preſerving the purity of the faith:* But I muſt aſk him ſtill, *how*, and in *what method*, are we to hold faſt the faithful word? Does a *general direction* to *hold faſt the faithful word*, limit it to Mr. *Chandler*'s *method* of doing it, by holding faſt the *mere words* of Scripture only? If not, then *his* means are not *ſpecified* in this rule; which, as *exceeding particular* as he ſays it is, is not

[r] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 66.

not half ſo *exceeding particular*, as *his reaſoning* upon it.

But it "expreſsly determines the method how "Biſhops are to preſerve the purity of the faith, "in oppoſition to all heretical oppoſers[s]".—An heretic underſtands the *words* of Scripture in a *perverted* ſenſe, and explains them in that ſenſe to the people; and Mr. *Chandler* is to *oppoſe* this heretic, and *convince* the people of the contrary doctrine, and *preſerve the purity of the faith* — How? Why, by *holding faſt*, and *repeating* to them, the *mere words* of Scripture only, and *no other*; and I ſuppoſe he is as likely to *convince* the people, as to *oppoſe* the heretic, by this method, *to any purpoſe*.—If this were all, a *cobler* is as able to *oppoſe an heretic* and *convince the people*, as Mr. *Chandler*, if he can but read the Bible.

We have a great deal more tautology, about the *one faith* which the word of God contains, the *words of faith*, the *form of ſound words*, the *good depoſit*, and the like[t]"; from which he argues in the old ſtrain — "So that the *particular way* to "maintain the doctrine uncorrupt, is for paſtors "to teach what the Apoſtle hath taught them, "what they have learnt *from* his words[u]" — True; But does this prove, that theſe paſtors are tied down hereby, to teach it only *in* his words; without attempting to explain thoſe words; to ſet their genuin ſenſe, and the doctrine really contained in them, in its true light; in oppoſition to other paſtors, who have corrupted and perverted thoſe words, by falſe gloſſes and conſtructions?

And now, after more ſtill about the *form of doctrine*, and the *good depoſit*, and making himſelf a little

[s] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 66.
[t] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 67. [u] Ibid.

little merry with St. *Paul*'s caution, not to be *toſſed to and fro by the ſleight of men*, εν πανουργια προς την μεθοδειαν της πλανης, which he elegantly renders *cogging the dice*; he begins, with great ſelf-complaeency, upon a review of his learned labours, to be "*aſtoniſhed*, how any writers of integrity "and credit can quote all theſe paſſages of Scri-"pture, and yet gravely tell the world, that "*theſe are all general rules*, which are ordered to "be obſerved by the Church [x]" — But I ſee no reaſon, from any thing Mr. *Chandler*'s *New Teſtament* has produced, to induce me to look upon theſe apoſtolical directions to be at all more particular and *ſpecifical means*, than I did before.— Whenever Mr. *Chandler* finds that there *is not any force in his reaſoning*, then, *he is aſtoniſhed* — Now, *I am aſtoniſhed* whenever I find that there *is*.

"But every one of them (he ſays) evidently "and particularly confronts and condemns the "practice"— of what? Why, "of ſubſtituting "the doctrines of men in the room of the doc-"trines of the word of God, of ſetting up any "other form of ſound words, as the teſt of un-"corruptneſs in the faith, than what that con-"tains [y]".—Does any practice in the Church of *England* come under this cenſure? Are explanatory articles any farther contended for, than they ſhall appear to be *warranted by holy Scripture*, and *may be proved thereby?*—Does not this declaration make a part of their explanatory articles? — But the quæſtion between Mr. *Chandler* and me (which he induſtriouſly obſcures) is, not, whether Scripture, that *form of ſound words*, be not the *only teſt* of *ſound doctrine*; But, whether *it's being ſo*, proves

[x] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 68.

[y] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 68.

proves that *therefore*, when the *words* of *this teſt* have been *perverted* to *different* and *contradictory meanings*, have been underſtood, and made uſe of, in different ſenſes by different men; whether, in *ſuch circumſtances*, an *explanatory examination*, or, the requiring an aſſent to explanatory articles, be not *neceſſary*, in order to diſcover whether the candidates for the miniſtry hold the one true faith, *contained* in that form of ſound words; the neceſſity of diſcovering which, immediately follows from the allowed right of *examination* into their *qualifications* for the office of Public Teachers; which has been before ſhewn. — *This* is the quæſtion between Mr. *Chandler* and me; and therefore all his *long harangue*, about the *form of ſound words* being the *only teſt of faith*, is nothing at all to the purpoſe.

Upon the whole, I now leave it to the reader to determine, whether Mr. *Chandler* has made out the point he undertook to prove, *viz.* that what I call *general*, *apoſtolical rules*, or *directions* to preſerve the faith of Chriſt, and to try and examine the candidates for the miniſtry; are, on the contrary, *not general* rules, but *particular*, and *ſpecifical means*, and methods of doing this, as *excluſive* of all explanatory inquiries; and in the *mere words* of Scripture only. For *This* is what he muſt prove, or, the reader is deſired to obſerve, he proves nothing. — The force of all he has ſaid amounts to no more than this; that, to hold faſt the *doctrine* of Scripture, is the only *means* to be made uſe of to preſerve the *Scripture-doctrine*; which are identical propoſitions.—'Tis undoubtedly true, but proves nothing in the preſent quæſtion; and therefore, after all, my argument ſtill remains good, that theſe *general rules* and directions, are ſo far from *excluding*, that they *authorize* an *explanatory inquiry*.—And now the reader

is

is enabled to make a judgment, from this and other inſtances, whether Mr. *White* and myſelf, or Mr. *Chandler*, are *ill-acquainted with our Bibles.*

I ſaid, that when the Apoſtle gave rules to the Governors of the Church, no doubt he deſigned they ſhould "make uſe of means proper to this "end, and did not ſpecifie them. — *What then* (ſays Mr. *Chandler*) *are his rules good for*[z]? — Leſs pertneſs, Sir, and more caution might not have been amiſs. — He arraigns the wiſdom and prudence of the Apoſtle, upon ſuppoſition that he ſhould not be found to have *ſpecified* the *particular means* and methods, of preſerving the purity of faith, and trying the candidates for the miniſtry, in *all times* and *circumſtances*; ſuch *means* as *exclude all explanatory inquiry*, by the *mere words* of Scripture only; and ſays, he would not have done *like all other men of good ſenſe*, if he had not[a]. It would have become him therefore, to have been *very certain*, that he has, or can produce *one* text that will fairly prove this. If he neither has, nor can, his reflection becomes ſerious. — But his *zeal* againſt ſubſcription, has *eaten up* his prudence— Peeviſhneſs muſt be vented, at the expence of the *inſpired Writers*, and his *bolts be ſhot*, though they *light even upon an Apoſtle.*

In the progreſs of my argument, I obſerved, that "it would indeed have been impoſſible for "the Apoſtle to have given *particular* rules about "things of this nature; Becauſe *they* [the *par*-"*ticular* rules, or *means* of performing the *gene*-"*ral* directions of preſerving the faith] muſt "*change* and *vary*, according to the *variation* of "*times* and *circumſtances*[b]".—In anſwer to which, Mr.

[z] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 60.
[a] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 60.
[b] Church of *England* vind. p. 35.

Mr. *Chandler* aſks— " What? was it impoſſible " for the Apoſtle, under the influence of the " Spirit of God, to deliver the doctrines of " Chriſtianity in a plain and intelligible manner? " If not, then it was poſſible for him to deliver " as plain a rule, and to ſpecify as certain means " to preſerve theſe doctrines in their purity [c] ". That is, was it impoſſible for the Apoſtle to deliver the doctrines of Chriſtianity, in ſo plain and intelligible a manner, as it ſhould not be *ever poſſible* for any *weak* and *fallible* men to miſunderſtand, or to *pervert* and put *falſe ſenſes* upon, the *words* in which thoſe *doctrines* were delivered?—which is a quæſtion I leave him to anſwer.

THE Scripture may be plain and intelligible enough to *juſtify providence*, though not plain enough to overcome *ſpiritual pride*, and *ſelf-conceitedneſs*; or to *over-rule* the *nature of things*. — As long as men are *moral*, *fallible Agents*, I apprehend it will always be *in their power* to *pervert*, or may be their *misfortune* to *miſtake*, the *ſenſe* of *Scripture-words*. Nothing can be *ſo plain* (Mr. *Chandler* has taught me that) but ſome men may not underſtand it, or may *pervert* it to *their own* ſenſe— By what rule then could the Apoſtle guard againſt all innovations, all falſe gloſſes and miſinterpretations of Scripture, and make it impoſſible for men to uſe Scripture-*words* in *different* ſenſes? Mr. *Chandler* ſays, by this " one very obvious " rule, *viz.* to adhere to theſe doctrines in the " plain and intelligible manner the Apoſtle hath " delivered them, and try all human opinions by " them [d] ". He means, in and by *Scripture-words* only.—What! When every ſect and party of Chriſtians, *equally adhere* to Scripture *words*;

[c] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 69.
[d] Ibid. p. 69, 70.

yet All *differ* as to the *meaning* of them? Will any man then, of common ingenuity, perſiſt in maintaining, that the uſe of Scripture-*words only*, is a *ſufficient means* to *diſcover* what each of theſe ſects and parties of Chriſtians *mean* by them; or that all human opinions may be tried, or *diſcover-ed* to be true or falſe by Scripture-*words* only; when the *falſe* as well as the *true*, *equally claim* Scripture-*words* but in *different ſenſes?*—A *Papiſt* holds *tranſubſtantiation*, and he quotes, and adheres alſo (I think ſufficiently) to Scripture-*words*. How are you to try this *human opinion* by Scripture *words?* I know but one way; and that is, by inquiring whether theſe Scripture-*words* do *really ſignify* what he underſtands by them: But this introduces *explanation*; which is not to be performed by *adhering only* to the *very words*, about the *meaning of which*, the quæſtion is.—What then is become of Mr. *Chandler's one very obvious rule to try all human opinions by, and to preſerve the one true Scripture-doctrine?*—unleſs he means, that by *adhering to Scripture-words*, you preſerve the doctrine in *your Bible*; though men uſe them, and explain them abroad in as many *different ſenſes* as they pleaſe.— It would ſeem ſtrange, that there ſhould be ſo much difficulty, in making men underſtand a plain thing. Let any unprejudiced man judge, whether there can in nature be ſo *idle*, and *ridiculous* a pretence, as that an aſſent to Scripture-*words only*, is a *ſufficient teſt* that any one holds the one only true Scripture-*Senſe* of thoſe words; when thoſe words are uſed to ſignify *different things*, and as containing *different doctrines*. The real truth muſt be, that men *know it is not*, and *therefore* contend ſo ſtrenuouſly for the uſe of it — They would take upon them the office of public teaching, *without diſcovering* what their faith and opinions are; and therefore plead

plead for *ſuch a teſt* as they *know cannot diſcover* them: And this may be a good reaſon for their plea; But then, to inſiſt at the ſame time, in the face of common ſenſe, that it *is* a *teſt* of their opinions, is going ſuch lengths, as they ought to be *aſhamed* of.

He aſks— "How doth the variation of times "and circumſtances affect the methods for pre- "ſerving the purity of the Chriſtian faith[e]?"— I refer him to what I told the *Old Whig*[f]; and to what he has obliged me to tell *him*, over and over.—In order to *preſerve* the *purity of the Chriſtian faith*, it is proper to take as much care as poſſible, not to admit any to the office of Public Teachers, but thoſe who will teach the *pure Chriſtian faith*, and not teach and propagate *falſe* and *erroneous doctrines* inſtead of it.—In order to this, it is neceſſary to *try*, and *examine* thoſe who offer themſelves as candidates for that office, *whether they hold the pure Chriſtian faith*, or *erroneous doctrines*.—To perform this *tryal* by Scripture-*words*, may be ſufficient in ſuch caſes, and in ſuch times, when and where men are *agreed* about the *true ſenſe* of *thoſe words*.— In other caſes and circumſtances, where the many *different* and *contradictory ſenſes*, put upon Scripture-*words*, have rendered it *uncertain* in *what ſenſe* any man *uſes* Scripture *words*; there, an *explanatory inquiry* will become *neceſſary*, in order to *diſcover* whether theſe candidates for the office of Public Teachers, *do* or *do not* hold the *true Scripture faith*; and more or leſs explanatory, a more or leſs ſtrict inquiry, as more or leſs falſe gloſſes, and interpretations of Scripture-words have gained ground.—This account, I think, is agreeable to truth and reaſon, and

[e] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 70.
[f] Church of *England* vind. p. 35.

ſufficient to ſatisfy any man, *how the variation of times and circumſtances may affect the methods for preſerving the purity of the Chriſtian faith*— except a *weak* man who *can* not, or an *obſtinate* one who *will* not, be ſatisfied.

It is therefore wholly impertinent to aſk ſuch quæſtions as theſe.— "Is that faith ſufficiently "explicit and clear[g]".—I anſwer—the *words* of Scripture having had *different ſenſes* put upon them, it becomes *not clear* in *what ſenſe* any perſon *uſes* ſuch *Scripture-words*; nor is an aſſent to Scripture-*words only*, in ſuch caſes, *explicite* of any man's *faith*.

"Produce it as it is, in its own native ſim-"plicity and purity, and it will always prevail "with honeſt minds[h]".—Mr. *Chandler* has *forgot himſelf*. We are diſputing, not, whether the Chriſtian faith, produced in its native ſimplicity and purity, be ſufficient to ſhew the truth to honeſt minds; But, whether an *aſſent* to Scripture *words only*, will ſhew to *others*, whether a perſon holds the *one true Scripture-doctrine*.—But, to take him in his own way—produce Scripture-words (for that is what he contends for) when it is known that they have had *various*, *different*, and *inconſiſtent ſenſes* and *meanings* affixed to them, and have been accordingly made uſe of to ſupport *different* and *inconſiſtent doctrines*; produce *Scripture-words* under *ſuch circumſtances*, and try *in fact* whether they will *convince all honeſt minds*, and induce them to *agree* in the *one true faith* of Scripture.—If this be the caſe, then no *two* men of *honeſt minds* would ever *differ* about the *ſenſe of Scripture*.—But is this fact?

Again—

[g] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 70.

[h] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 70.

AGAIN— "Is the chriſtian faith obſcure and "intricate [i]?"—Yes; ſo far as the preſent quæſtion is concerned. Men have made the *uſe* of mere Scripture-words *inſufficient* to *diſcover* the *faith* of him who *refuſes* to give an account of it in *any* but *thoſe words alone*, by the methods above-mention'd.—"What methods (ſays Mr. "*Chandler*) can the Governors of the Church "take, to render what God hath left obſcure, "more clear and intelligible [k]?"—I anſwer; by *taking away the obſcurity*, and fixing, according to *right reaſon*, and *true criticiſm*, according to the beſt of their judgment and conſcience, the *one, only genuin ſenſe and meaning*, not of *what God hath left obſcure*, but of what *man hath made ſo*.—He may ſay, if he pleaſes, that Church-Governors may, by affixing one ſenſe to Scripture-words, affix a falſe ſenſe — They are indeed fallible; But ſtill, ſince the due and conſcientious diſcharge of their office, and the nature of it, make it *neceſſary* that they ſhould act herein according to the beſt of their judgment; their being *fallible* in the *uſe* of the rule, proves nothing againſt the *rule itſelf*—They are anſwerable for it.

"PLAIN truth (ſays he) is the beſt diſcoverer "of every thing that is oppoſite to it [l]"—But the quæſtion is, *where the plain truth lies*, in *which* of the *ſeveral different* interpretations which have been given to Scripture-words.—*Mere words*, without ſome *meaning* affixed to them, are only *unſenſed characters*; and when *different meanings* have been put upon them, and *equally contended for*, the previous neceſſary inquiry is, *what is* their *true ſenſe*, before the *truth* of what is contained in them can be judged of—Plain truth, before it be *found out*, cannot be a *diſcoverer* of any thing.

"TRY

[i] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 70. [k] Ibid. p. 70. [l] Ibid. p. 70.

" TRY hereſies and errors (ſays he) by the " ſtandard of ſound doctrine [*i. e.* by Scripture-" *words* only] and their enormity will inſtantly " become viſible [m]."—What! when the quæſtion is about the *meaning* of the words of this ſtandard, and what the ſound doctrine of them is?—

" WHETHER (ſays he) there be few hereſies " or many hereſies, *Socinian*, or *Arian*, or *Atha-*" *naſian*, or *Sabellian*, or *Tritheiſtic*, or *Armi-*" *nian*, or *Lutheran*, or *Calviniſtic*, or *Popiſh* he-" reſies; this ſingle rule is univerſally applicable " to them: *Hold faſt the Apoſtle's form of ſound* " *words* [*i. e.* the *mere words* of Scripture] their " diſſonancy with this model and form [*i. e.* the " diſſonancy with the *mere words* of Scripture] " will inſtantly appear [n]."—All which requires no other anſwer, than that every man knows it to be, in the preſent circumſtances, *directly contrary to fact and experience.*—How comes it, that all theſe different doctrines are taught, as Scripture-doctrines; if *producing the mere words* of Scripture are *ſufficient* to ſhew them all in an inſtant the *diſſonancy* of every one that is wrong; and why do not all theſe men *agree*, ſince *all* of them *hold faſt* the *mere words* of Scripture?—

LET us ſuppoſe one of each denomination he has mentioned, a *Socinian*, an *Arian*, an *Athanaſian*, a *Sabellian*, a *Tritheiſtic*, an *Arminian*, a *Lutheran*, a *Calviniſt*, and a *Papiſt*; All ſitting in conſult, and debating together concerning their *ſeveral opinions*, and which of them, or how many of them, are the *true Scripture-doctrine*; when, after many learned arguments on all ſides, without being able to come to any agreement, out comes Mr. *Samuel Chandler*, with *his* New Teſtament in his hand—" Gentlemen, ſays he, what, " in

[m] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 70. [n] Ibid. p. 70, 71.

" in the name of common ſenſe, are ye All diſ-
" puting about? The thing is as eaſy to be de-
" termined as poſſible—ſee here—here is *my New*
" *Teſtament*, which *moſt certainly and expreſsly*
" *determines the rule of tryal.*———Here is the
" *form of ſound doctrine*, the *wholeſome words of*
" *Chriſt*, the *good depoſit*—Here, only read theſe
" *mere words*, and they will ſoon end all your
" differences. Theſe *mere words* alone are the
" *plain truth*, the *beſt diſcoverer of every thing that*
" *is oppoſite to it*—This is the Τυπωπωσις, the
" *form*, the *model*, the *touchſtone*, to *try all your ſe-*
" *veral opinions by*—Bring them to the *teſt* of theſe
" letters and ſyllables, there can be *no deception or*
" *impoſition*—Hold faſt this *form of ſound words*; I
" mean the *mere words* of this form; and *all will*
" *be ſafe*—judge all your opinions by theſe, and
" things will be clear at once; *the falſe and the*
" *true will inſtantly appear*; and if you are but
" *honeſt men*, you will *agree* about 'em pre-
" ſently."—Now I aſk any man of plain ſenſe,
what would be the event? Why, in all human
probability, the *Socinian*, the *Arian*, the *Athana-*
ſian, and the reſt of 'em, would riſe up, and
" thank Mr. *Chandler* for his *good intentions*; but
" would let him into the ſecret, that they All
" knew, as well as he, that there were *certain*
" *words* in the Bible; that *their* New Teſtament
" and *his*, were exactly the ſame; that they All
" equally aſſented to this *form of ſound words*,
" and were diſpoſed to *hold it as faſt* as himſelf:
" But, that their difficulties and differences, unluc-
" kily, depended upon the *meaning* of thoſe words,
" which had *all their ſeveral ſenſes* put upon them;
" and had equally been alledged, and contended for,
" in ſupport of their *reſpective opinions*; and that
" conſequently, in order to determine their con-
" troverſies, they found it neceſſary to *do more*

" than

" than to *hold faſt the form* of Scripture-*words* " *only*; namely, to inquire after the one true " *doctrine contained* in thoſe words; and in order " to this, to examine, debate, and make an *ex-* " *plicite inquiry*, as far as they were able, and ac- " cording to the beſt of their judgment and con- " ſcience, into the *ſenſe* and *meaning* of *thoſe* " *words*—that it was to this end they were now " met together; and therefore, that he *might as* " *well go about his buſineſs*, and not interrupt " them any farther; for that the method *be* pro- " poſed, of making them *All ſee inſtantly* the " true doctrine, by *adhering* to the *mere words* of " his New Teſtament; when *their* differences " were about the *meaning* of them, was *idle and* " *impertinent*"—and, if they laughed at him into the bargain, he might thank himſelf for his pains. —Though, perhaps, they would think him worthy better treatment, when they ſhould be informed, that he had no ill will to any of them; and, to convince them that he had no intention to *banter* them, ſince they had aſſured him that they were all ready to aſſent to the *form of ſound words*, he *deſired no more*, and was ready *to make one among them*, to *embrace them as brethren*, and to *live and die* with them—nay, to admit every man of them to the office of Public Teachers in *his Church*, and to give them free liberty, licence, and protection, to preach and propagate *all* their *ſeveral opinions*, as ſhould *ſeem good in their own eyes*; and acknowledge their equal right and claim to *Church preferments* and *emoluments*—For, whether he ſows wheat or tares, *the labourer is worthy of his hire.*

And now Mr. *Chandler* adverties the public, that Mr. *White* and his *fellow-labourer* the *champion*, have " found out a *catholicon*, a *univerſal* " *remedy*, a *choice ſpecifick*, *mixed up* with *the bitter* " of certain penalties, and the *ſweet* of *ſome good* " *comfortable*

" *comfortable emoluments*, equally proper for all " *conſtitutions*, and by which, it *muſt be confeſſed*, " they have wrought ſundry very *remarkable* " *cures*[o]."—I hope he does not mean here to *confeſs*, that theſe ſame *good*, *comfortable emoluments*, are what have wrought the *remarkable cure* upon himſelf and friends, in the affair of *comprehenſion*—though it *muſt be confeſſed*, it has appeared, in the courſe of this debate, that they are not wholly *improper* for his *conſtitution*.—But after this aukward attempt to be *witty* (which is not his talent) upon Mr. *White* and the *Champion*; he ſays, that " it " is abſurd to tell the world, that particular rules " muſt change and vary, according to the variation of times and circumſtances, when delivered " by an Apoſtle, when they themſelves have a " particular rule, which they ſuit and apply to all " variations of times and circumſtances, and allow " to be equally proper for one church, as for another[p]." *i. e.* ſubſcription to explanatory articles[q].—But is this a true, and *honeſt* repreſentation of the matter? Have I any where ſaid, either directly or indirectly, that *ſubſcription to explanatory articles* is the *one only* method *equally proper* to be uſed in *all churches*, and in *all times* and *circumſtances*?—No; I *expreſsly declared*, that I thought a rule proper for *one church*, might not, even at the *ſame time*, be ſo for *another*; and that it was for *this very reaſon*, that the Apoſtles could not have given *particular rules*, which muſt thus *vary* according to *times* and *circumſtances*[r]; and I *expreſsly limited* this particular method of *ſubſcription to explanatory articles*, to ſuch times and circumſtances only, when and where the Governors of any Church ſhould judge them to *require* it[s].—

[o] Caſe of Subſcription, p 71, 72.
[p] Ibid. 72. [q] *Vid.* Ibid.
[r] Church of *England* vindicated, p. 35. [s] Ibid. p. 41.

Is this *ſuiting* and *applying* the rule of *ſubſcription* to *all variations of times and circumſtances?* Is this *allowing it to be equally proper for one church as for another?*—'Tis pity that the heat of controverſy ſhould make Mr. *Chandler forget himſelf ſo far*, as not to have a little more *regard to truth.*

He ſays—" if this particular rule and method " be proper to preſerve the faith of their articles " pure and uncorrupt, then it will follow, that " ſubſcribing to any other form is equally neceſ- " ſary and proper for the ſame end, and that " therefore a ſubſcription to the doctrine of Chriſt " and his Apoſtles, *in the words in which they* " *have delivered them*, will be an equally proper " method to preſerve their doctrine pure and un- " corrupt [t]."—In like manner he had before *jumbled together* Biſhop *Burnet's expoſition*, Pope *Pius his Creed*, and the *Koran of Mahomet*; in order to tell us, that explaining the words of ſcripture by the *articles*, is the ſame abſurdity, as it would be to explain *thoſe articles* by biſhop *Burnet's expoſition*, Pope *Pius's Creed*, and the *Koran of Mahomet*; inſtead of adhering only to the *words* of the articles [u].—— The whole is a *rhapſody*, nothing to the purpoſe: For if we were to examine any man's faith in any *articles*, where the words of *them* have been uſed in *different* and *contradictory ſenſes*, and to ſupport *different* and *contradictory doctrines*, as contained in *thoſe articles*, ſo as to render it impoſſible to *diſcover*, by the uſe of thoſe *words only*, what doctrine any one intends to expreſs by them, and to ſubſcribe to in them (which is the caſe in regard to mere Scripture-words in many inſtances) a ſubſcription to ſuch articles in *thoſe words*, will be *equally inſufficient:* ſo that this argument (ſuch as it is) proves nothing.—He lets us here into a ſecret

[t] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 72.
[u] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 39.

ſecret however, that the articles *of the Church of England* have no more relation to *Scripture-doctrine*, than Pope *Pius his Creed*, or the *Koran of Mahomet* have to the *articles*; for otherwiſe, his *parallel* will be as bad as his *argument*, and that is bad enough. — How the *Koran of Mahomet* came in, no one will wonder, who recollects Mr. *Chandler*'s *wandering diſpoſition*. He who travels to *Sweden*, and from *Sweden* to *Moſcow*, from *Moſcow* to *Geneva*, from *Geneva* to *Scotland*, from *Scotland* to *England*, and from *England* to *Rome*[x] (and with as little improvement or advantage to his argument, as moſt of our modern travellers do to *themſelves*) 'tis no wonder he ſhould take *Conſtantinople* in his way.

MR. *Chandler* now draws towards a concluſion of this chapter; and therefore is reſolved to give the reader, before he has done, a *caſt of his ſkill* at drawing conſequences again.

I HAD ſaid, that "all the texts commanding "Church-Governors to preſerve the faith of "Chriſt whole and entire, are ſo many warrants "for the making uſe of all the expedients which "the nature of the thing requires, or human pru-"dence ſuggeſts[y]."—Obſerve Mr. *Chandler*'s concluſion from hence—"*So* that if human prudence "ſuggeſts ſuch expedients as the nature of the "thing doth *not* require, the Apoſtle warrants "them to make uſe of *them*[z]."—Though I am got ſo far in the examination of Mr. *Chandler*'s book, this would almoſt perſuade me to throw by my papers, and give myſelf no farther trouble, with one who argues in ſuch a manner as cancels all claim and pretence to reaſoning.—"The Governors of the Church are warranted to "make uſe of all the expedients which the nature of

[x] *Vid.* Caſe of Subſcription, p. 42.
[y] Church of *England* vindicated, p. 35.
[z] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 74.

" the thing requires, or human prudence ſuggeſts." Here Mr. *Chandler* makes the word *or* (which he therefore prints in capitals) to be an *excluſive term*, and to ſignify, that any expedients ſuggeſted by human prudence may be uſed, *though* they be ſuch as the nature of the thing does *not* require.—Would not a plain honeſt man wonder, how he could *hammer out* ſuch a conſtruction of my words? the plain, obvious ſenſe of which, is no more than that Church-Governors are warranted from Scripture, to make uſe of ſuch expedients as the nature of the thing requires, or human prudence, from conſidering and weighing what the nature and circumſtances of the thing *do* require, ſhall ſuggeſt to them: And if Mr. *Chandler* can produce any one man, who has ever read that paſſage, that underſtood it in the ſenſe he puts upon it; or that will ſay, the words are *fairly capable* of any ſuch ſenſe; I will then admit that he had *ſome* reaſon for this obſervation—But if the reader ſhall be of opinion, that Mr. *Chandler could not but know*, (when I mentioned *equally* the expedients which the *nature of the thing* ſhould require, or the expedients which *human prudence* ſhould ſuggeſt) that the expedients ſuggeſted by *human prudence*, were not there meant as *excluſive* of the regard, *at the ſame time mentioned*, to be had to the *nature of the thing*—If the reader ſhould be of opinion that Mr. *Chandler could not but know this*; I leave him to judge of his *conſcience*, and of the *ſolemn appeal* he makes to God, that he has no *intention to deceive or prejudice any one perſon living*—I told you I had learned from Mr. *Chandler*, that nothing could be *ſo plain* and intelligible, but that it may ſtill be either miſunderſtood, or *perverted*.

And this I ſuppoſe will be thought a ſufficient reply to the *inventory* he gives in the next page, of " *impriſonments, confiſcations, mutilations, baniſh-*

" *ments,*

" *ments, halters, fires, faggots, cruſadoes, maſſa-*
" *cres, inquiſitions*"—one would think he had been bred an attorney, and learned to value his papers, as the other does his parchments, according to the number of lines and ſyllables—But, " all " theſe (he ſays) if human prudence ſhould ſug-" geſt them, would, according to my account, be " warranted by the Apoſtle [a]." As if, becauſe *ſuch* methods are authorized, as *true human prudence*, upon conſidering what the nature of the thing really requires, ſuggeſts to *wiſe* and *ſober* men; ſuch methods only as are juſt, lawful, and neceſſary; therefore all ſuch *other* methods are authorized, as *human paſſion*, and a *zeal without knowledge*, ſhall happen to ſuggeſt to *zealots* and *bigots*; methods which the nature of the thing does *not* require, and which are neither juſt, lawful, nor neceſſary, but inhuman, wicked, and deteſtable.

He ſays, " 'Twould be difficult even for in-" vention itſelf to give a worſe character of the " Apoſtle than this [b]"—Why then did he give it? for the picture is of his *own drawing*; and, as difficult as it was, we ſee Mr. *Chandler* could compaſs it. Nothing that I have ſaid will contribute to its *likeneſs*—'Tis indeed the product of *invention itſelf*, and that invention is *his own*.

But Mr. *Chandler* has not done with St. *Paul* yet. He ſays, that " if he thought he deſerved " this character, *he would have nothing to do with* " *him* [c]."—I muſt tell Mr. *Chandler*, that even to mention *that character* and St. *Paul* together, is *indecent*: But, to ſay that *he would have nothing to do with him*, is a *guſt of zeal* that had better have been ſuppreſſed. For tho' it be ſaid only on ſuppoſition, that the character he has delineated, would, if St. *Paul* had left it to Church-Governors to make

[a] *Vid.* Caſe of Subſcription, p. 75.
[b] Ibid. p. 74. [c] Ibid.

make uſe of ſuch expedients in the caſes above-mentioned as human prudence ſhould ſuggeſt, be the character of the Apoſtle (which is not true) yet, it would, methinks, have become him to have remembered *what company he was in*, and to have obſerved a *little more modeſty* and *reverence*, when even *ſpeaking of* ſuch *venerable characters*. —To ſay of St. *Paul*, that *he would have nothing to do with him*, is, upon any ſuppoſition, much leſs upon one of *his own invention*, not language to ſpeak in of an *Apoſtle*—I believe Mr. *Chandler*'s *zeal* to be as great as he would repreſent it; and I do not doubt, but he would *ſeparate* and *diſſent*, even from an *Apoſtle*, if the latter ſhould not think as *he does*—But notwithſtanding that, is he ſo *inveterate* againſt *all who differ from him*, that he cannot even treat them, though they ſhould be the *inſpired writers themſelves*, with *decency of language*? —Where is the man of moderation, and extenſive charity!—But this, I ſuppoſe, is an effect of his *noble and virtuous pride*, in which he *boaſts* to have *eſtabliſhed himſelf* [d] — And Mr. *White* and the *Champion*, may now eaſily excuſe the effects of it to *them*, when even *Martyrs* and *Apoſtles* are treated with ſo much *familiarity*.

But he thinks to ſalve all, by telling us, that St. *Paul* "was a wiſer, and an honeſter man;" which we knew before: But, what he adds, that "thus to repreſent his character and doctrine, is "to do the higheſt injury to both [e]", ſhould have been a *caution to himſelf*; for the *repreſentation* is *his own*, and he alone is therefore anſwerable for the *injury* thereby *done to both*; as well as for the *indecency* of telling him, *he would have nothing to do with him*.

He

[d] *Vid.* Caſe of Subſcription, p. 39.

[e] Ibid. p. 75.

He winds up the chapter with *railing* at all *Church-Governors*, ancient and modern, " whoſe " prudence and diſcretion (he ſays) have been ſo " often, and in ſo many ages, *only* employed to " *enſlave mankind*, and *aggrandize themſelves*. " Men that have *kindled a fire* in the church; " and, inſtead of ſhepherds and governors, have, " *as all will allow*, been too frequently the *mer-* " *cyleſs deſtroyers* of the flock of Chriſt, *&c.*[f] "— As to all which, I ſhall only remind him, that he has *forgot himſelf* again, and *grown warm*; the *paroxyſm*, I find, is upon him; and therefore it will be beſt to leave him to *compoſe himſelf*, and to *grow cool* at his leiſure.

I Shall only remark, that it is obſervable, whenever theſe gentlemen *grow warm* againſt the *Church of England*, they preſently cry out *Popery*. Thus Mr. *Chandler*, here in the cloſe, tells us, that this " *iniquitous ſubſcription-ſcheme* forces us " into conceſſions, that juſtify the expedients that " *Papiſts* make uſe of to oppreſs the *Proteſtant re-* " *ligion* and *liberties*;[g] " and, in the like *warm* " *fit*, he tells us afterwards, that " the practice " of ſubſcriptions amongſt the divines, came from " the *Church of Rome*;[h] " and therefore ſubſcription is *popery*. As if *every* practice in that church, *becauſe there*, muſt be *popery*. 'Tis for the ſame reaſon, I ſuppoſe (and I am glad they have no better) that *epiſcopacy*, *preconceived forms of prayer*, the *croſs in baptiſm*, and *ſurplices*, are all *rank popery*.—The *Papiſts* ſay the *Lord's Prayer* too—I wonder theſe gentlemen ever conſented to do it, for that reaſon—It was a ſaying (I think of King *Charles* II[d]) that a diſſenter from the Church of *England*, was a Proteſtant, *frightened out of his wits*;

[f] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 75.
[g] Ibid. p. 76. [h] Ibid. p. 150.

wits; and indeed the religion of too many ſeems to be only a kind of *negative religion*; they are *not Papiſts*, and that's enough; and whoever practices any thing in common with the church of *Rome*, though ever ſo reaſonable, have therefore the *mark of the beaſt* upon them.—And there is an end to be gained by *this cant*—Popery, prieſtcraft, ſpiritual tyranny, and the like, "are (to uſe the "ſtile of our learned and excellent apologiſt) fine "words to lead up a *cry* with, when the clergy "are to have the *mob raiſed about their ears*, and "to be made odious[i]."—In ſhort, *popery* includes, and is to ſignify every thing, though ever ſo diſtant from it—They are deſired to rehearſe the articles of their belief, and they cry, *popery!* and they would do the ſame, like *Scrub* in the comedy, if their *houſe was a robbing*.

III.

MR. *Chandler*'s next exceptions, are to the *examples* which I cited, to confirm the opinion of the authority, here claimed to Church-Governors, from the *practice of antiquity*.

I had ſaid, that "if we look into the practice "of the primitive church, we find they made uſe "of this very method of *ſubſcription*[k];" and for this I refer'd to Mr. *Bingham*'s *Origines Eccleſiaſticæ*, B. IV. c. iii. ſect. 2. where he tells us, that the tryal of candidates for the miniſtry, "was "made three ways: partly, by obliging the e-"lectors to give in their public teſtimony of "them; partly, by obliging the perſons elected "to anſwer to certain *interrogatories* or *quæſtions of* "*doctrine*

[i] Apology for the Clergy of the Church of *England*, p. 34. ——*Lond.* 1734.

[k] Church of *England* vindicated, p. 42.

" *doctrine* that were put to them; and partly, by " making them *subſcribe a body of articles*, or con- " feſſion of faith, at the time of their ordination." And in proof of this, he cites a *law of Juſtinian*, and the IVth *Council of Carthage*; the one, to ſhew that the perſon to be ordained, " was required to " give in a libel, or *form of confeſſion* of his faith, " *ſubſcribed with his own hand*;" the other, to ſhew that " a particular form of examination was " required, by way of *interrogatories* levelled a- " gainſt the moſt noted hereſies."

UPON this Mr. *Chandler* obſerves, that, " be- " cauſe I was not at leiſure to produce any thing " of my own, I moſt learnedly refer to Mr. " *Bingham*'s *antiquities*[1]."—Truly, I muſt con- feſs, that, had I been ever ſo much *at leiſure*, I ſhould have imagined, that *producing any thing of my own*, when I was to *cite authorities*, would have been very little to the purpoſe, and too much like Mr. *Chandler*'s method of reaſoning.

AS to referring to Mr. *Bingham* for the ancient authorities; as I was there expreſsly, at the ſame time, producing alſo Mr. *Bingham*'s *opinion*, who had as accurately examined into *antiquity* as Mr. *Chand- ler*, and was, I ſuppoſe, as capable of forming a judgment of what might be proved from thence; it was more proper to cite *him*, for the authorities *he* produced in ſupport of his opinion, which I was there delivering, concerning the practice of antiquity; than the *authorities alone:* Becauſe the *judgment* of a writer, of that *credit* and *character*, which Mr. *Bingham* has *hitherto* borne in the learned world, is, in this caſe, of *great weight in itſelf*; as it may be concluded to have been form- ed, not merely from *thoſe authorities there cited*,

[1] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 78.

but *upon his whole view* of antiquity: And it was, beſides, but fair and juſt to acknowledge the writer, to whom I was obliged for pointing out thoſe authorities.—Mr. *Chandler* perhaps might have thought it a better way, to have put off the *marginal learning* of another, for our own, without mentioning him; and this indeed carries with it a *greater ſhew*, and *parade* of learning and reading: But, it is well known, that, in reality, nothing is more eaſy than to *appear thus learned*, and requires but little expence of trouble or thought: And who can tell, whether Mr. *Chandler*'s *learned collection of ancient creeds*, of which he has made ſuch oſtentation in this book, may not, if the truth were known, have been derived from ſome ſuch ſources. —*Index-learning* is very extenſive, and a compendious method of procuring admiration, among *ſome people*, without much ſtudy or labour; which (as Mr. *Pope* ſays)

——turns no ſtudent pale,
Yet holds the *eel of ſcience*, by the *tail*.

But to come to the point—The IVth *Council of Carthage* preſcribes a particular form of examination, by way of interrogatories, to the biſhop who was to be ordained—"What then? (ſays Mr. "*Chandler*.) How doth this prove that they "made uſe of *this very method of ſubſcription*, as "he undertook to prove?—There is not a word "of this in the Council of *Carthage*[m]." But did I undertake to prove, from *this particular authority*, that the ancient church required this very method of ſubſcription? No; to prove *that*, I cited afterwards a *law of Juſtinian*, which will be conſidered preſently. I was here *previouſly* ſhewing, that

[m] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 78.

that they made uſe of a method which is *equivalent* to ſubſcription, *viz. interrogatories.* —— "Sup-
" poſe it is (ſays Mr. *Chandler*) doth every honeſt
" man that honeſtly anſwers a quæſtion, ſubſcribe
" to it [n]"? No, if he did, then it would have been a *direct* proof of ſubſcription, and cited as ſuch; whereas I intended it only as a proof of the uſe of a method *equivalent*, with every honeſt man; which it does prove, and therefore proves all I deſign'd to prove by it.

As to the *edict of Juſtinian, viz.* that the Biſhop to be ordained, was required to give in a libel, or form of confeſſion of his faith, ſubſcribed with his own hand; Mr. *Chandler* thus comments upon it, —"*i. e.* (ſays he) the perſon to be ordained ſhall
" make *his own confeſſion*, and ſubſcribe it. But
" what hath this to do with the modern method of
" making the perſon to be ordained to ſubſcribe
" a creed ready drawn up to his hand by others,
" and which he had no ſhare himſelf in making
" of [o]"?

Now this objection, which may ſeem to carry ſomething plauſible in it upon a tranſient view, and which Mr. *Chandler*, I warrant you, thought of marvellous force, will, when we come to look a little nearer, appear to be juſt nothing at all.—For pray, good Sir, conſider, that when explanatory articles are offered to any one for his ſubſcription; it is not expected that he ſhould ſubſcribe, 'till he has *carefully examined what they contain*, and whether they include any thing which *he does not believe* to be agreeable to, or conſiſtent with *Scripture-doctrine*.—If they do, 'tis ſuppoſed, and to be hoped, that he will not ſubſcribe: But if he finds that they do not, then the caſe is juſt the ſame, as if he had *drawn up his own confeſſion*.

[n] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 78. [o] Ibid.

Subſcribing ſuch articles, will be no other than *ſubſcribing his own confeſſion*; ſince he is not deſired to *ſubſcribe*, 'till he is *ſatisfied* that they contain no more than is *conſiſtent* with his *own faith and conſcience*; that is, 'till, by ſuch examination and aſſent, he has *made them his own.*—To what purpoſe then does Mr. *Chandler* talk of a creed *ready drawn up to his hand by others*, and which *he had no ſhare himſelf in making of?*—Yes, he has a ſhare in making it; For he is ſuppoſed to have *examined*, and *aſſented* to it *before* he *ſubſcribes*; and *thereby* to have *made it his own.*— Will any one, but Mr. *Chandler*, complain, that a man who takes an oath, or executes a deed or a bond, is forced to execute a deed, or take an oath, *ready drawn up to his hand by others?* or will he ſay, that ſuch an one has *no ſhare in making them*, becauſe he was not the *attorney* who *drew them up?* —Are not all men ſuppoſed to *examine* and *aſſent*, and thereby to *make* them *their own*, before they *execute* or *ſubſcribe?* — The caſe is the ſame in *ſubſcription to explanatory articles*; and therefore the *edict of Juſtinian*, which requires the perſon to be ordained to give in a form of confeſſion ſigned with his own hand, has *more to do* with the *modern method* of ſubſcription, than Mr. *Chandler* is willing it ſhould; ſince a man, by *examination* and *aſſent*, hath as much *ſhare in making* his own creed, though *drawn up* by another, as if he had *drawn it up himſelf*; and *without* ſuch *previous examination and aſſent*, no man, by the *modern method* of ſubſcription, is expected, or deſired to *ſubſcribe*.

But he farther objects, that this *edict of Juſtinian* was in the *ſixth century*, and the *council* of *Carthage* in the *fourth*; and therefore, that theſe are not proofs from the *primitive church* [p].—Theſe proofs

[p] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 78, 79.

proofs are *ſufficiently primitive* to confirm what *I produced them for*. The practice of ſubſcription, I have all along pleaded for only when ſuch practice ſhall become *proper* and *neceſſary*; and expreſsly ſaid, that the methods of church diſcipline muſt *vary*, and did *vary*, according to times and circumſtances, the exigences of ſeveral ages and churches.—In ſome ages, examination by a particular form of *interrogatories*, *levelled againſt the moſt noted hereſies* (he method preſcribed by the fourth *council of Carthage*) may be thought ſufficient—in others, *ſubſcription* (the method mentioned in *Juſtinian's edict*) may be found neceſſary. In the very firſt ages of the Church, they might not have any neceſſity or occaſion for ſuch methods, or might think them not expedient.—What then? in a few centuries they did, and, when they did, they practiſed them—in the *ſixth* century, the *very method of ſubſcription*; and, in the *fourth* century, a method *equivalent* to it; and this is proved from the *edict of Juſtinian*, and the fourth *Council of Carthage*. — What then would Mr. *Chandler* be at?—Why, it ſeems, I have not proved, that the particular method of ſubſcription was practiced in the *firſt*, *ſecond*, or *third* centuries, or among the *Apoſtles*. — Nor did I undertake it: But I have proved all that it was *neceſſary* for me to prove in this caſe, *viz.* that this practice is no *modern*, *novel invention*, but a practice of at leaſt *above a thouſand years ſtanding* in the Church. The *proofs* therefore of the *antiquity of the practice*, reach as high as the *argument* required. If they prove the *very method of ſubſcription*, and a method *equivalent* to it, to have been *practices* in the *ancient church*, for *above a thouſand years* ſince; I ſhall not wrangle about words: And if he will not take this for the *primitive Church*, I ſhall leave him to diſpute againſt Mr. *Bingham's*

Bingham's Title-page; and to cenſure that learned and judicious writer, for calling his collections, *Origines eccleſiaſticæ*, and for his *Title* of the *chapter*, where theſe *very proofs* are cited: *viz.* "Of the exa-" mination and qualifications of perſons to be or-" dained, in the *primitive church*."

As to his remark——"doth he not know that " there is ſome quæſtion as to the authenticity of " theſe canons[q]"? He may, I think, be contented with the ſame anſwer, which he once gave to Dr. *Berriman*, concerning the date of the *Council of Conſtantinople*, then in quæſtion.—"You " ſhould know, that learned men differ about it, " and that I have the liberty to follow my own " judgment[r]".—However, there was no reaſon I ſhould look upon there having been *ſome quæſtion* here, ſo far to *invalidate* their authority, as to preclude a reference to them; any more than the learned Mr. *Bingham* did, who cites their authority nevertheleſs, for the ſame purpoſe — unleſs Mr. *Chandler* will oblige me to take which ſide of the quæſtion *he* pleaſes.

Mr. *Chandler* next refers to "the caſe of *Sy-* " *neſius*, a *Platonick Philoſopher*, choſen Biſhop of " *Ptolemais*, in the fifth century, A. C. 420" (he ſhould have ſaid A. C. 410) "*as evidently pro-* " *ving* all that he wants to prove, *viz.* that even " at that time there were no *publick Creeds* drawn " up by the Church, ſubſcription to which was " made a conſtant neceſſary condition of ordina-" tion; becauſe had there been any ſuch con-" dition, *Syneſius* could not have complied with " it, ſince he expreſsly denied *the commonly re-* " *ceived notion of the reſurrection*;" and that "'tis " certain

[q] Caſe of Subſcript. p. 78.

[r] Anſwer to Dr. *Berriman*'s Brief Remarks, on Mr. *Chandler*'s Introduction to the Hiſtory of the Inquiſition. 1733. p. 48.

" certain he could not, and did not ſubſcribe to " any of the received orthodox creeds of thoſe " times, in which the article of the reſurrection " is almoſt univerſally found." And from hence Mr. *Chandler* " concludes that, as *Syneſius* was " not ordained, moſt certainly, without any con- " feſſion of his faith; he did, *according to the an-* " *cient cuſtom*, deliver in *his own confeſſion of faith*, " and that though he omitted to declare his be- " lief of the reſurrection in it, it was borne with, " out of great eſteem for the man, and in hopes " that at length he might ſee, and be brought to " the acknowledgment of this truth [s]".

That *Syneſius* delivered in *his own confeſſion of faith*, may be true: But how will this prove, that *this method* was the *ancient cuſtom*, or even the cuſtom of *that time?* Might not the *general cuſtom* have been *otherwiſe*, and this be *borne with* in *Syneſius*, upon ſome *particular* and *extraordinary* accounts? May not the *Caſe of Syneſius* have been a *ſingular inſtance*; and if ſo, capable of proving nothing to Mr. *Chandler*'s purpoſe? — though he tells us, *it proves all that he wants to prove.* —— And, indeed, this is generally thought, by the Learned, to have been the truth of the matter.

THE caſe was this. — About the year 410, the people of *Ptolemais* deſired *Theophilus*, Biſhop of *Alexandria*, to make *Syneſius* their Biſhop. But *Syneſius* refuſed, and confeſſed that he did not believe the doctrine of the *reſurrection of the Body*; and declared, that he would accept the epiſcopal office upon no other conditions, than a compliance with his ſcruples; unto which *Theophilus* at length conſented, and ordained him, in reſpect to his probity and the integrity of his life, and in hopes that he might afterwards believe [t].

BUT

[s] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 79, 80.
[t] Vid. Cave Hiſt. literar. Vol. 1. 389. edit. 1740.

But learned men have hitherto looked upon the conduct of *Theophilus* herein, as *ſingular* and *irregular*. They endeavour to account for it, ſome by ſuppoſing that *Syneſius* only diſſembled; others, that he changed his opinion before he was ordained; But the beſt account of the thing is given by *Holſtenius*, that it was the man's admirable virtues, and excellent qualifications in other reſpects, and a great want of fit men to thoſe difficult times, that induced *Theophilus* to ordain him, in hopes that God would inlighten his mind, and not ſuffer ſo excellent a perſon long to labour under ſuch errors in religion; nor did theſe hopes deceive him [u].——Theſe endeavours of the learned, to *account* for the *conduct of Theophilus*, ſhew that they all looked upon it to have been an *irregular* and *uncommon* proceeding; while, as Mr. *Bingham* obſerves, "the *general practice* of the Church was "to *examine* mens orthodoxy, and require their "*aſſent* and *ſubſcriptions to the rule of faith*, before "their ordination [x]".

'Tis agreed, that to *ordain Syneſius*, while he could not *profeſs a belief of the reſurrection* was, ſo far, *ſingular and irregular*: And therefore, ſuppoſing it to have been the cuſtom of the church, in thoſe times, to have *required ſubſcription* to *public creeds* or *articles*, and yet that *Syneſius* only gave in a *private declaration drawn up by himſelf*, as Mr. *Chandler* concludes he did; yet this may be eaſily *accounted* for: For *Syneſius could not* (as Mr. *Chandler* himſelf obſerves) *ſubſcribe to ſuch creeds or articles, in which the article of the reſurrection is almoſt univerſally found.* And ſince (as Mr. *Chandler* likewiſe ſays) *he was not ordained, moſt certainly, without any confeſſion of his faith*; what

[u] Vid. Bingham's Origin. eccleſiaſt. B. iv. C. iii. Sect. iii. and Cave, ubi ſupr. [x] Ibid.

what indeed was to be done, if *Theophilus* determined to ordain him, but to take what he would give him.——Now, if the caſe of *Syneſius* delivering in his *own confeſſion*, may be thus *accounted* for, even *ſuppoſing* the *general cuſtom* nevertheleſs to have been *otherwiſe*; how does this prove, that *Syneſius* acted *according to the ancient cuſtom*, as Mr. *Chandler concludes*; whoſe *concluſions* are generally too quick for his *premiſes*.—— Does not the whole ſtory ſhew it to have been a *ſingular caſe?* and does not That rather prove (the contrary to what Mr. *Chandler* would have it prove) that, ſince *Syneſius* was *ſuffered* or *tolerated* in this, upon ſome *particular* and *prudential* reaſons; the *general* uſage, the *ancient*, and even the then *preſent cuſtom* of the Church, was different?—— So that this pretence, from the *caſe of Syneſius*, even from Mr. *Chandler*'s own repreſentation, turns againſt him.—But we ſee how ready *Toleration* is, in every inſtance, to advance itſelf into a *right of eſtabliſhment*.

THE authorities he procedes to cite, with great ſhew of marginal learning, from St. *Clement*, St. *Cyprian*, the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, *Origen*, the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, and St. *Paul*, concerning the primitive method of examining perſons to be ordained [y]; prove nothing in the preſent quæſtion.—— "The primitive method (he ſays) was "quite different from interrogatories, or giving in "a confeſſion of their faith ſigned [z]". But the authorities he cites, prove nothing of this. They prove only, that ſuch men alone were to be ordained, who had the *approbation of the Church*, and were *worthy perſons*, of *unblameable life and converſation*, men of *reputation and character*.——

[y] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 81—85.

[z] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 81.

And what of all this? Does this *exclude* the ſuppoſition of the knowledge of their *faith*? Does he think, or would he have his readers think, that theſe writers meant to tell us; that, if a man's *life* and *morals* were blameleſs, they would therefore have *ordained* him, if they had any reaſons to believe or ſuſpect, that he held doctrines contrary to the received *faith* of the Church, without farther examination? He intended to *palm this upon us*, but muſt look out for other *authorities*; for thoſe he has here produced will not ſupport him; unleſs he can ſhew, that the qualifications there mentioned, are mentioned as *excluſive* of all *knowledge* and *inquiry* concerning their *faith*.

IV.

THE next head of inquiry is, concerning *my anſwer* to the *argument* which the *Old Whig* had drawn, againſt ſubſcription to explanatory articles, from the *brevity* and *ſimplicity* of the *moſt ancient creeds*.

UNDER this head, Mr. *Chandler* has been very long; and I have generally found, throughout his performance, that he is indued with the faculty, of always *talking moſt*, where he has the *leaſt to ſay*.

FOR the "entertainment and profit (he ſays) "of thoſe who have not leiſure or learning to "conſult the originals", he will give them a collection of ancient creeds [a].— If they ſhall chance to *entertain*, or *amuſe* the *unlearned reader*, it will be well; For, I can aſſure him, they will appear to others, to be of no farther uſe in the preſent quæſtion: But ſince he has been at ſo much pains, I muſt not paſs by this *learned collection*, without a few obſervations; and if I ſhall happen to *ſpoil* this

[a] Vid. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 87.

this *entertainment*, which Mr. *Chandler* has been here *ſerving up* to the *unlearned reader*, he will, I hope, excuſe me; ſince it is to prevent his being *impoſed upon* by it, and to hinder him from *implicitly ſwallowing* what Mr. *Chandler* has here *provided for him*.

" Mr. *Bingham* (he ſays) to whom the world " is much indebted for the learned collections he " hath made, as to the antiquities of the Church, " hath given us a tranſlation of ſeveral of the moſt " ancient creeds; beginning with that of *Irenæus*. " I ſhall go higher *&c*" and as the forms they " have left us, are not thrown all together in any " treatiſe that I (ſays he) have ſeen, I ſhall give " them in their proper order [b] ".

ONE would expect, from this preamble, that Mr. *Chandler* had here done great matters, and given us a perfect collection of genuin creeds.—And yet, what does it all amount to?—Why,

HE has added *one* from *Irenæus* [c], to That which Mr. *Bingham* had given: And he might have added more if he had pleaſed; For *Irenæus* has given ſeveral ſuch creeds, or, more properly, expoſitions of the ancient baptiſmal creed: But Mr. *Bingham* thought one to be ſufficient, and therefore gave it [d]; without retailing all the parts of *Irenæus*'s writings.—But what Mr. *Chandler* has added, ſerved to inlarge the number, and make a ſhew with, and That was enough.

AGAIN—He has given us *two* from the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, inſtead of *one* which he found in Mr. *Bingham*; to no other end, but for the ſake of *number*.——

[b] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 87, 88.
[c] Ibid. p. 99.
[d] Origin. Eccleſ. B. x. C. iv. Sect. 1.

THAT which he gives in common with Mr. *Bingham*, is indeed a *creed*, in the *form* of one, and to be recited *as a creed* by the candidate for Baptiſm.—It is introduced, in the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, with — ἀπαγγελλετω ὁ βαπτιζομενος ὑπ τω ἀποτασσεσθαι: which *renunciation* the Author then procedes to ſet down— ἀποτασσομαι &c. Then he goes on— μετ ταυτα ὑποταγω σωτασσομενος λεγετω, ὁτι συντασσομαι τω Χριστω—and then repeats the *creed*, as Mr. *Bingham* and Mr. *Chandler* have given it— πιστευω και βαπτιζομαι &c. [c]—Here is a direct proper creed, *delivered as ſuch*; which Mr. *Bingham* gives as one "moſt probably then uſed in ſome of the "Eaſtern, or Greek Churches [f]."

THE other, which Mr. *Chandler* "could not "(it ſeems) diſpenſe with himſelf without giving "his reader, [g]" is no more than an *occaſional*, *diſcurſive declaration*, of what the Church held and taught, occaſioned by the mention there made of the hereſies and falſe doctrines of *Simon*, *Cerinthus*, and others; in oppoſition to which this *account* of the true faith is given [h]: But it is no *creed*, nor delivered as ſuch—except by Mr. *Chandler*.

ANOTHER *Creed* which he has added, is from *Athenagoras*; and what is it?—Why, "*Athena-* "*goras* (he ſays) in his Legation for the Chri- "ſtians, to *Mark Antonine* and *Commodus*, hath "left us ſeveral ſummaries of the Chriſtian faith, "the principal of which I ſhall mention, refer- "ring only to the others [i]:" And then he *mentions* theſe *ſeveral ſummaries*, which are only ſeveral

[c] Conſtitut. Apoſtol. L. vii. C. 40, 41.
[f] Origin. Eccleſ. B. x. C. iv. Sect. vii.
[g] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 118.
[h] Vid. Conſtitut. Apoſtol. L. vi. C. xi. compared with C. viii. ix. x.
[i] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 100.

ral *diſtinct* and *ſeparate* paſſages, collected from *Legat. pro Chriſtian.* p. 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 44. which being here *put all together* by Mr. *Chandler*, they make a *creed*: And you may, it ſeems, make *more creeds* of the ſame kind, by *putting together*, in like manner, what you find in p. 19, 21, 22, 46, 96. *Edit. Dechair. Oxon.*—to which he refers.

Now, can any man, with a ſerious countenance, give in ſuch things for *creeds*; which are only a *collection of his own*, from ſeveral *ſeparate paſſages* of *Athenagoras*'s *Legation*, wherein he is giving to the Emperors an account of the Chriſtians, and their religion?

What he next gives us, is from *Clemens* of *Alexandria*; and is only a paſſage wherein he ſays, that "we ought truly to believe in the ſon, that "he is a ſon, and that he came, and how, and "for what reaſon, and concerning his paſſion. "For it is neceſſary to know who is the ſon of "God, *&c.*[k]"—Mr. *Chandler* himſelf owns, in introducing it, "that *Clemens* of *Alexandria* hath "no where delivered any direct, regular formu-"lary of belief[l]."—why then did he endeavour to *put this paſſage upon us* for *ſuch a formulary*, by *citing* it in what *profeſſes to be* a *collection of ſuch formularies?*—why, becauſe "*Clemens of Alexan-*"*dria* hath yet ſaid enough to ſhew, what were "his ſentiments as to the great diſtinguiſhing ar-"ticles of Chriſtianity[m]."—And ſo, in whatever writings we can find *enough ſaid to ſhew* the author's *private ſentiments* as to theſe articles; we may *pick it out*, and put it into a *collection of creeds.*

He has found out another "*creed*, in a trea-"tiſe concerning the *chariſmata*, or *gifts of the* "*ſpirit*,

[k] Strom. l. 5. *Init.* Caſe of Subſcription, p. 102.
[l] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 102. [m] Ibid.

" *ſpirit*, aſcribed to *Hippolytus*;" the introduction, and concluſion of which, plainly ſhew it to be no *creed*, nor to be *delivered as ſuch*.—" *There is* " *no man, who through Chriſt believes in God, who* " *hath not received a ſpiritual gift*; *for* to believe in " God the Father through Chriſt, is the gift of " God, *&c.*" Thus it is introduced; and, proceeding with other articles, concludes—" *He that* " *believes theſe things*, not negligently or irrationally, but with judgment and full aſſurance, " *hath received the gift from God*[n]."—The deſign of the author, in this paſſage was, not *to deliver a creed*, but (agreeably to the ſubject of the treatiſe, which was concerning the *chariſmata*) to deliver *this particular doctrine, viz.* that *a true and right faith*, is χαρισμα θεου, *a gift of God*.

He cites another *creed* from the ſame father, in his tract againſt *Noetus*, if it be his: But it is only another *occaſional declaration*, that Chriſtians " truly know one God;" that they " know " Chriſt;" that they " know the Son ſuffered, " *&c.*" and that " theſe things which they had " learned, they affirm[o];" and is no more there intended for a *creed*, than the former—whatever it be here.

The *creed* he gives from *Novatian*'s *Regula fidei*; like that from *Athenagoras*, is compoſed of *three, diſtinct, ſeparate* paſſages, collected from *three, different chapters*; and, by Mr. *Chandler*, conſolidated into a *creed*[p].—The whole is only *declaratory* of what the rule of truth requires us to believe; but is not given as the *rule itſelf*, or as

[n] Hippolyt. Oper. V. 1. p. 246. Edit. Fabric. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 105.

[o] Hippolyt. ibid. contr. Noet. p. 6. §. 1. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 106.

[p] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 116. *Novat.* Cap. 1. Cap. 9. Cap. 29.

as any *creed*, or *formulary of faith*; which is ſufficiently plain from the *diſcurſive*, *rhetorical ſtile* of the firſt paſſage [q].

To theſe he adds the *formulary*, which *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea* read before the Emperor, at the *Council of Nice*; which, though "the author of "it (as Mr. *Chandler* ſays) declares it to be a-"greeable to the ancient doctrine, and taken from "the holy ſcriptures [r];" is yet (as it is rightly obſerved by *Buddeus*) a *mixture*, of the creed then in uſe in the Eaſtern Church, and of *his own private additions* and *explications*, in order to clear himſelf from the errors imputed to him [s]; and therefore, as it there ſtands, no public or authorized *creed*.

These are the *wondrous additions*, which Mr. *Chandler* has thought neceſſary to make to Mr. *Bingham*'s account of creeds, after *Irenæus*.

But he thinks it proper to *go higher* [t]; and accordingly cites *Barnabas*, *Clement*, *Ignatius*, *Polycarp*, and *Juſtin Martyr* [u].

Mr. *Bingham* was not ignorant of *ſuch creeds*. He tells us, that "Some fancy the creed may be "found in the writings of *Ignatius*, *Clemens Ro-*

"*manus*,

[q] Regula exigit veritatis, ut primo omnium credamus in Deum Patrem et Dominum omnipotentem, id eſt, rerum omnium prefectiſſimum conditorem, qui Cœlum *alta ſublimitate ſuſpenderit*, terram *dejecta mole ſolidaverit*, maria *ſoluto liquore diffuderit*, et hæc omnia propriis et *condignis inſtrumentis* et *ornata et plana* digeſſerit.—*Novat.* c. 1.

[r] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 121. Socrat. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. 8.

[s] ——Euſebius Cæſarienſis, dum in Concilio Nicæno ſuſpicionem hæreſeos a ſe amoliri voluit, ſymbolum, quod tunc in uſu erat, loco confeſſionis ſuæ obtulerit, adjectis dumtaxat quibuſdam, quibus, mentem ſuam ab errore alienam, docere adnitebatur.—*Budd.* Iſag. ad Theol. Tom. 1. p. 491.

[t] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 87.

[u] Ibid. p. 89——96.

" *manus*, *Polycarp*, and *Juſtin Martyr*." But he agrees with Biſhop *Pearſon*, who " has obſerved, " that theſe writers, however they may inciden- " tally mention ſome articles of faith, do not for- " mally deliver any rule of faith uſed in their own " times;" " the firſt that ſpeaks of this, (ſays " Mr. *Bingham*) is *Irenæus*[x];" and therefore he thought it improper to go any higher: But Mr. *Chandler*, who, it ſeems, has the *fancy* above-mentioned, thinks otherwiſe; and you ſhall hear his reaſon for it: It is, " Becauſe it is equally " true of *Irenæus* and the fathers after him; that " they did not deliver any rule of faith, agreed " upon by the *common conſent of the church*, as an " authentick, authoritative, *common ſtandard*[y]:" But, though the collections which Mr. *Bingham* has made, from *Irenæus* downwards, were not the authentic, authoritative, common ſtandard creeds of the church; yet they were (he tells us) the " *ſcattered remains* of the *ancient creeds*, " which were *compoſed for the uſe of ſeveral church-* " *es*, as they are ſtill upon record in private wri- " ters[z]"——But is the caſe the ſame with Mr. *Chandler*'s creeds, *before Irenæus?*

WAS what he cites from *Barnabas*, *viz.* " If " therefore the Son of God, who is Lord, and " ſhall hereafter judge the quick and the dead, " ſuffered, that his ſtripe might quicken us; let " us believe that the Son of God could not ſuffer, " but for us, *&c.*[a]"—Was this even one of the *ſcattered remains* of any *creed compoſed for the uſe of any church?* which is only part of an *epiſtolary inſtruction* of it's author—For that *Barnabas* was the

[x] Origin. Eccleſ. B. x. C. iv. Sect. 1. *Pearſon*'s Expoſition.
[y] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 87.
[z] Origin. Eccleſ. B. x. C. iv. Sect. viii.
[a] Barnab. Epiſt. c. 7. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 89.

the author of it, is (by the way) more than Mr. *Chandler* knows. That being a point, wherein the learned are not agreed.

Is *Clement*'s *exhortation to peace and unity*, by this *argument*, *viz.* " have we not one God, and " one Chriſt, and one Spirit of Grace that was " poured out upon us, and one calling in " Chriſt? [b]"—Is this alſo the *remains* of any *creed?* would any one, but Mr. *Chandler*, cite theſe words for a *creed*, or for any *part* of one? Or could even *he* do it, on any other account, but for the ſake of *number?*—After having cited which, he ſays,—" though there be no *other for-* " *mal rule of faith* delivered by *Clement* [c] "—And has Mr. *Chandler* then the face to ſay, that *this* was delivered by *Clement*, as a *formal rule of faith*; which appears to be nothing more, than a few words uſed only as an *exhortatory motive* to *peace and unity?*—

WELL; but this being the *only formal rule of faith* delivered by *Clement*—What then?—Why then, Mr. *Chandler* will do as much for him, as he did for *Athenagoras* and *Novatian* before; he will " put together the heads of doctrine that he " mentions in other parts of his letter, c. 20. 24. " 16. 27. 7. 36. 24. 25. 28. 35. and 8. [d] " and, ranging all theſe in proper order, *Clement* becomes the author of another *formal rule of faith* —of Mr. *Chandler*'s making.

WE have more *work* of the ſame kind, in relation to two *ſuppoſititious Epiſtles*, aſcribed to *Ignatius*—" I ſhall add here (ſays he) the heads of " doctrine, as we find them in theſe two epiſtles:" —and ſo he collects again from c. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,

[b] Clement Epiſt. c. 46. Caſe of Subicription, p. 89.
[c] Ibid, p. 98.
[d] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 90.

of the Epiſtle to the Chriſtian Converts at *Tarſus*; and from c. 1, 2, 3, of the Epiſtle to the *Philippians* [e]; and theſe, with the help of a little of Mr. *Chandler*'s dexterity, preſently become *two creeds*. —This is *manufacturing* creeds indeed! and Mr. *Chandler* has, in this famous collection, ſhewn himſelf to have ſo good a hand at it; that 'tis pity any body ſhould take the employment from him—A little more exerciſe in this way, may in time perhaps bring him to have a better opinion of creed-making.

FROM the *ſmaller Epiſtles of Ignatius*, he cites him ſaying—"cloſe your ears when any one ſpeaks "to you without Jeſus Chriſt, who was of the "ſeed of *David*, *&c.*[f]"—From the *larger, interpolated Epiſtles*, he quotes the author thus addreſſing himſelf to the *Magneſians*—"Beware that "ye fall not into the ſnares of vain opinions, but "be ye fully eſtabliſhed in Chriſt, begotten of the "Father before all ages, and afterwards born of "the Virgin *Mary*, without converſe with man; "who lived holily, *&c.*[g]"—But are any of theſe the *remains* of any *creed* ever *compoſed for any church?*—No more than what he next gives us from *Polycarp*, and *Juſtin Martyr*; the former of which is nothing but an *exhortation* to the *Philippians*, to "gird up their loins, believing in him "who raiſed our Lord Jeſus Chriſt from the "dead, and gave him glory, and a throne, *&c.* "—He who raiſed him up from the dead, will "alſo raiſe us up, if we do his will, and walk in "his commandments[h]"—which is juſt as much a creed,

[e] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 91—94.
[f] Ibid. p. 90. Ignat. Epiſt. ad Trall. c. 9.
[g] Ignat. Epiſt. ad Magneſ. c. 11. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 91.
[h] Polycarp Epiſt. ad Philip. c. 2. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 94.

creed, or the *remains* of a creed, as any one of Mr. *Chandler*'s ſermons. — What he gives from *Juſtin Martyr*, is only the *hiſtorical account*, or *narration* which he is giving in his *Apologies*, of the nature of the Chriſtian doctrines[i]. Mr. *Chandler* ſays, that "other paſſages of like nature might be produced "from this Father"—Aye, and from *every Father* that ever wrote about the *Chriſtian Religion*— "But as they are much the ſame (he ſays) with "thoſe already cited, he will only refer[k]"—for which, once in my life, I am obliged to him; and having already, by the ſpecimen he has given, a ſufficient knowledge of *his judgment* concerning *creeds*, muſt be excuſed from giving myſelf the trouble of turning to them upon this occaſion.

BUT now how ſtands Mr. *Chandler*'s *excuſe* for *going higher* than *Irenæus* for *creeds*; and for *fancying* he could find them in *Ignatius*, *Clement*, *Polycarp*, and *Juſtin Martyr*; where Biſhop *Pearſon* and Mr. *Bingham*, who were not, it ſeems, ſo *ſharp-ſighted*, could never meet with any? —"It is equally true (ſays he) of *Irenæus* and "the Fathers *after*, as of thoſe *before* him, that "they did not deliver any rule of faith, agreed "upon by common conſent of the church, *&c.*" and therefore he thinks he may as well *go higher*, and take what paſſages he can find in the writers *before Irenæus*, which are *expreſſive* or *declaratory* of the *Chriſtian doctrine*, and *put them upon us* for *ancient creeds*.—But (as I obſerved before) though Mr. *Bingham*'s collections, from the writers *after Irenæus*, 'till he comes to give the *more perfect forms* of the creed, were not the *authorized formal rule* of faith; and ſo far may ſtand upon an equa-

[i] Juſtin Martyr. Apol. 1. p. 11. p. 30, 31. Apol. 2. p. 114, 115. Edit. Thirlb. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 94—96.
[k] Ibid. p. 96.

lity with thoſe which Mr. *Chandler* has *gone higher* for; yet, they were (he tells us) the *remains*, or perhaps *expoſitions*, of the *ancient creeds* which were *compoſed for the uſe of the churches*, as they are upon record in private writers—Here Mr. *Chandler*'s creeds are defective—they are neither *creeds*, nor *remains*, nor *expoſitions of creeds*; nothing more than ſuch *incidental paſſages*, declarative of the Chriſtian doctrine, as every Chriſtian writer will afford us in every page—But who, before Mr. *Chandler*, ever called them *creeds*, or *confeſſions*, or *formal rules of faith*, or any *parts of ſuch?*

BUT he has not done yet; for he can *go higher* ſtill, even than *Barnabas* and *Clement*, for creeds; for, it ſeems, St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* muſt be called in to ſwell his collection.

"The firſt is (he ſays) the creed of *Simon Peter*;" which, he tells us by the way, "was "not intended for *catechumens* only."—Well; what is this creed of *Simon Peter?* Why—"Thou "art Chriſt, the ſon of the living God [l].

THE creed of St. *Paul* is—"Though there be "that are called gods, whether in heaven or in "earth, as there be gods many, and lords many; "yet to us there is but one God the Father, "*&c.*[m]"—But does he really think that the learned reader will look upon *this collection* of his, as any *improvement* upon Mr. *Bingham?* Has Mr. *Chandler* the vanity to expect, that the world will look upon *his performance* in that light? Mr. *Bingham* has given what was ſufficient to ſhew the nature of the ancient creeds, and the faith of the primitive Church.—What Mr. *Chandler* has added, are of no other uſe but to *tell among the reſt:* And if every paſſage which may be found in the

[l] Matth. xvi. 16. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 88.
[m] 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. Caſe of Subſcription, p. 88.

the primitive writers, where the Chriſtian faith is declared or taught, is preſently to become an *ancient creed*, or *formulary of faith*; his collection is really a *moderate one*; For he might have made it as large as he had pleaſed.—Yet this is all Mr. *Chandler* has done, in the *additions* he has here made to Mr. *Bingham*.—A great many *primitive names* printed in *capitals*, with good ſtore of *greek* and *latin* in the margin.—A *collection of ancient creeds*, introduced with the oſtentation of having *done more* than Mr. *Bingham*, or *any man before him*; for they have not, it ſeems, been "thrown "all together in any treatiſe that he has ſeen;" and though the world is "*much indebted* to Mr. "*Bingham* for his *learned collections*, who hath "given us a tranſlation of ſeveral of the moſt "ancient creeds;" yet, 'tis expected no doubt that the world ſhould be *much more indebted* to Mr. *Chandler* for *his* learned collections; For *he* will *go higher*, notwithſtanding Biſhop *Pearſon's obſervation*, &c. [a]—All this was to catch the *unlearned reader*, and Mr. *Chandler* was to paſs for a *very learned man*; and ſo he may be, for ought I know.—But as to his *collection of creeds*, it is nothing but *parade*, and *ſhew*.—He ſays they were "never thrown all together *in any treatiſe before*." Indeed I believe not, nor will *ever be again*. Mr. *Chandler* is the only man who would call ſuch things, *formularies of faith*, and *throw them together* (as he aptly enough expreſſes it) as a *collection of ancient Creeds*.—He did well to tell us at the entrance, that he *prepared* this "*entertainment*, "for thoſe who have not *leiſure* or *learning* to "*conſult the originals*"—and he has *cook'd it up* accordingly.

HOWEVER

[a] Vide Caſe of Subſcription, p. 87.

HOWEVER, he is ſo good to let every body into the ſecret at laſt; and tells you plainly, that he has all this while been only *entertaining* you indeed: For, after all the flouriſh he has been making, and after he has called them, and cited them an hundred times as *ancient creeds* and *formularies*, through ſix and thirty pages; He—*laughs in your face*, and tells you— "All the creeds I "have tranſlated, are only *mere private compoſitions*, "drawn up by particular perſons, according to "their *own ſentiments* of the Chriſtian doctrine; "without having, in the terms in which they are "delivered to us, the ſanction of any particular "Churches, much leſs of the univerſal Church [*]." —Why then did he call them *creeds*, and give them in as an *improvement* upon Mr. *Bingham*, or as a *more ample* collection of *Creeds* than that learned author had given us?—Mr. *Bingham* profeſſes to have given the *remains of the ancient creeds* which were *compoſed for the uſe of the churches*, beginning from *Irenæus*. Mr. *Chandler*, not ſatisfied, ſays, *he* will *go higher*,—for what? for the *remains of the* creeds *compoſed for the uſe of the Churches*; or for nothing. — But are then what Mr. *Chandler* has added, the *remains of the ancient creeds* which *were compoſed for the uſe of the churches?* No; he tells you himſelf, that they are *only mere private compoſitions, without having the ſanction of any church.* But, the truth is, they are not only *mere private compoſitions without the ſanction of any church*; but compoſitions *not intended for*, or *delivered as creeds at all*; and many of them the *compoſitions* of Mr. *Chandler* only; conſiſting not of the *ſcattered remains of the creed*, but of the *ſcattered ſentiments* and *ſeparate paſſages* of writers, collected by him from *different pages* and

[*] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 122.

and *different chapters* of their works; nay, from *different works*; and here *put together*, in order to *make creeds* of them: And therefore he not only has been here *putting upon the reader* ſuch compoſitions for *ancient creeds*, and *formularies of faith*; but muſt be called upon to ſhew, *to what purpoſe* ſuch compoſitions are here introduced, which have no relation to the quæſtion between us.

THE quæſtion was concerning *ſuch Creeds* as I had affirmed to have been "*originally intended* "for the uſe of *Catechumens*, and to have been "*firſt uſed only* in the *office of Baptiſm*, and which "were but by degrees taken in to make a part of "the *common* and *daily Liturgies* of the Church [p]." Now, what *Creeds* were here ſpoken of?—Why, undoubtedly, I could mean *no other creeds* than thoſe which *were* uſed for catechumens and in the *office of Baptiſm*, and which afterwards, from time to time inlarged, made part of the daily Liturgies; *public creeds of the church*, or creeds compoſed for public uſe; but which were only *ſhort* and *ſimple ſummaries* of credenda, agreeable to their *original uſe*, viz. for the *catechumens*. — In ſhort, I could mean *no other creeds*, than ſuch "*Creeds of the Chriſtian Church*" as the *Old Whig* had *appealed to* in general, and from the *ſimplicity* and *ſhortneſs of which*, he had *formed his exceptions* to the *explanatory articles* of the *Church of England*. If the *Old Whig* did not mean *public* creeds, but *mere private compoſitions*; theſe being no *creeds*, nor of *public uſe*, no argument could be formed from ſuch *mere private compoſitions*, not compoſed for *public uſe*, againſt *Creeds* which were ſo; much leſs againſt *explanatory articles* compiled for the *public uſe of the Church*, in examinations of the *candidates for the miniſtry*. — By the moſt *ancient creeds*

[p] Church of *England* vind. p. 25.

creeds of the *Chriſtian Church*, from the *ſhortneſs* and *ſimplicity of which*, the *Old Whig* argued againſt our *explanatory articles*, he muſt have therefore meant the *creeds* that were of *public uſe in the Church*; and of *theſe creeds* only it was that I aſſerted, in anſwer to him, that they were "originally intended for the uſe of catechumens, "and uſed at firſt only in the office of Baptiſm; "and were intended to be only ſhort ſummaries "of credenda, *&c.*" This is the ſtate of the quæſtion—and now attend to Mr. *Chandler*'s obſervations; who "muſt take the liberty (he ſays) "to tell me, that theſe aſſertions are not true, "and have nothing in antiquity, and the primitive writers to ſupport them. For what (ſays "he) are theſe moſt ancient creeds that he talks "of? Are they *Scripture*-creeds? If ſo, will he "be ſo good as to point out ſome few of theſe, "which were intended for *catechumens only*, and "which were ſo ſhort and ſimple, *&c.* Or (ſays "he) doth the gentleman mean by the moſt ancient creeds, ſuch as were drawn up by thoſe "who ſucceeded the firſt Biſhops and Paſtors of "the Church? If he ſhould affirm (continues "Mr. *Chandler*) that ſuch of theſe as are left on "record, were originally intended for the uſe of "*catechumens*, he will find it extremely difficult "to produce any proof of it. *I will take on me* "to affirm that there is none, as will evidently "appear to every one, who will take the trouble "to peruſe them [9]"—and then he produces his famous *catalogue of creeds*.—But what is all this to the purpoſe?—The intelligent reader muſt plainly ſee, that when I affirmed *creeds* to have been *originally intended* for the *uſe of catechumens*, &c. I meant, as my argument required me to mean,

creeds

[9] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 86, 87.

creeds, properly ſo called, the *creeds publicly uſed* as ſuch at *Baptiſm*—Theſe were the *creeds* I was ſpeaking of; and of which I affirmed, that they were "originally intended for the uſe of the cate-"chumens, and at firſt uſed *only* in the office of "Baptiſm;" of *which creeds* only, it was to any purpoſe to ſpeak, in my reply to the *old whig*.—What have I to do therefore with Mr. *Chandler*'s *creeds*, the character of which the reader is ſufficiently made acquainted with?—*Theſe*, it ſeems, he *muſt take the liberty to tell me*, were *not creeds originally intended* for *catechumens*, nor *firſt uſed only* in the *office of Baptiſm*; and, that they were, he will *take upon him to affirm there is no proof*—But, as far as theſe were not *public creeds*, nor ever authorized as ſuch, to be uſed for catechumens *at all*; but *mere private compoſitions only*, compoſitions *never intended for*, nor *delivered as* creeds *at all*; and many of them *compoſitions* of Mr. *Chandler*'s *own making* — Theſe are *compoſitions* of which I affirmed nothing, and therefore muſt take the liberty to tell *him*, that they are very impertinently introduced upon the occaſion.

But, before I diſmiſs this particular, I muſt obſerve, that what Mr. *Chandler* affirms of "all "the creeds which he has tranſlated, *viz*, that "they are only mere private compoſitions, drawn "up by particular perſons, according to their own "private ſentiments of the chriſtian doctrine;" though true enough of thoſe which he has added to Mr. *Bingham*; yet, is not ſtrictly and properly ſo, in regard to thoſe which he has given in common with that learned author; if we may preſume to put his judgment in the ballance with Mr. *Chandler*'s. For Mr. *Bingham* tells us, that what he had collected, from *Irenæus*, and the writers after him (and which Mr. *Chandler* has alſo given us) "were the *ſcattered remains* of the *ancient*

" *creeds*, which were compoſed for the uſe of " ſeveral churches[r];" and the creed cited from the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, he ſays was " the an- " cient creed, then moſt probably uſed in ſome " of the Eaſtern or Greek churches[s];" and which, by the way, is there *particularly appropriated* to the *uſe of the candidates for Baptiſm*[t].

If therefore Mr. *Chandler* will deny, that the *ancient creeds*, creeds properly ſo called, creeds *publicly uſed as creeds* by the *catechumens*, and in the *office of baptiſm* (of which *ancient baptiſmal creeds*, what Mr. *Bingham* has given us are the *remains* or expoſitions) were, in their *original* and *primary* intention, deſigned for that uſe; and that ſuch *public creeds*, ſo *uſed for catechumens*, and from time to time inlarged, did not even make a part of the daily ſervice of the church, 'till about the middle of the fifth century in the *Greek* church, and not 'till ſome time after in the *Latin* church— If Mr. *Chandler* will deny this of the *ancient creeds* properly ſo called, of which only I was ſpeaking, and of which only my argument required me to ſpeak;—I ſhall not miſſpend the readers time and my own, with a detail of arguments or authorities, to prove what is agreed upon by the learned, and ſo well known to every one, who has been tolerably converſant in antiquity. I will only juſt obſerve, that the thing is plain from this conſideration alone.—'Tis agreed that the apoſtles and firſt preachers, though they compoſed no one creed, as the authorized creed for the uſe of the univerſal church; yet, as occaſions offered, and as perſons came to *Baptiſm*, required their aſſent to *ſome creed*, to ſome of the *particular* and *fundamental* articles of the chriſtian faith. Theſe creeds *took their riſe* from the *form of Baptiſm*, and at firſt probably

[r] Origin. Eccleſiaſt. B. x. c. iv. ſect. viii.
[s] Ibid. ſect. vii.
[t] Conſtitut. Apoſtol. l. vii. c. 40, 41.

probably contained very little, if any thing more; and were the platform, and model of the creed ſince that time always uſed at baptiſm—*Baptiſm* was the *firſt admiſſion* into the *Chriſtian Church*, the *firſt occaſion there could therefore be* for the *uſe of creeds*; and accordingly, their *firſt uſe* was, we ſee, at *Baptiſm*, and that they *took even their original form*, from the *form therein uſed*. From hence, I think, it is no unreaſonable concluſion, that the *original* and *primary intention* of *creeds*, was for *that uſe*, which was the *original* and *primary uſe actually made* of them; and from whence they even *derive* their *original*.—Without therefore *pointing out any particular Scripture-creeds*, which were intended for *catechumens only*; it is ſufficient to point out, that the apoſtles and firſt preachers did uſe *ſhort* and *ſimple creeds*, for the *uſe* of the *candidates of Baptiſm*; or require an aſſent from them to ſome of the *fundamental articles*; which creeds took their very riſe from the *form* of Baptiſm, and were the platform and model of the future baptiſmal creed.—This alone ſufficiently proves the *original*, *primary uſe* and *intention of creeds* to have been for the *candidates of Baptiſm*; and, whatever other uſe they were afterwards put to, as this was their *original*, *primary* uſe, and as they continued to be uſed at *Baptiſm*, after they became *larger* than ſuch apoſtolical creeds, and ſtill to take their *model* from thence; it ſhews, that This was ſtill conſidered as their *primary* uſe; and their having been no more explicite than they were, is to be accounted for from this their *original*, *primary*, and *continued uſe*, and *model*, above-mentioned.

And if what he has taken upon him to affirm, be only of thoſe *mere private compoſitions*, framed for no ſuch uſe at all, which he has *thrown together*, and added to Mr. *Bingham*; with theſe I have not any concern—with his *addreſs* to me upon the

occaſion, I have.—He ſets forth his great ſuperiority of knowledge in antiquity, on this occaſion, with telling me, that I "take upon me to talk with "*great aſſurance* of the deſign and intention of the "moſt ancient creeds; and to give the reaſons "why they were no larger, nor more explicit"—that, he "muſt take the liberty to tell me, that "my aſſertions are *not true*, and *have nothing in* "*antiquity*, and the primitive writers to *ſupport* "them"—that, "with *great aſſurance* I appro-"priate ſuch creeds to baptiſm"—that, "he is "afraid I have *waded out of my depth*, and ven-"tured to *affirm more than I know*, or *am able* "*to prove*[u]."—Really, when I firſt read theſe formidable ſentences, I began to think, that ſurely I muſt have made ſome ſtrange blunder, in my account of theſe things: For that even Mr. *Chandler* himſelf could not, otherwiſe, have ventured, or *taken upon him*, in ſuch a magiſterial ſtrain, to have ſo dogmatically called me to account—But, what opinion the reader muſt now have at laſt, either of Mr. *Chandler*'s *knowledge in antiquity*, or of his *fair-dealing* on the preſent occaſion; I leave him to conſider.—If he did not know, that what I aſſerted of the *ancient creeds* of the church, was true of *ſuch* creeds, of *which only* I did aſſert it; it would have become him to have *waded* a little into antiquity, before he had *taken upon him* to teach it to others; and as the truth of my account is ſo well known to every one, who knows almoſt any thing of antiquity, the *firſt ſtep* in it is, I find, *out of his depth*.—But if Mr. *Chandler* knew, that my account of *theſe creeds* was really true; then, his attempt to *amuſe* ſuch readers, who have *neither leiſure nor learning*, with a long roll of *mere private compoſitions*, *foiſted thus upon them* for *thoſe creeds* of the church *of which only I was ſpeaking*; and

[u] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 86. 124.

and endeavouring, by the flaſh of his *bruta fulmina*, to dazzle the eyes of theſe readers, that they might not diſtinguiſh the truth; is a *mere ſhuffling trick*—And if he hoped to have it paſs, with other ſort of readers than thoſe which, it ſeems, he principally deſigned it for; they will, I dare ſay, join with me in thinking, that, when he told me, I "took upon me to talk with *great* "*aſſurance*"—there was no danger that *his own countenance* ſhould betray him.

So much for the *quæſtion of fact*, *viz.* "whether the *ancient creeds* of the church, properly "ſo called, were, as I aſſerted, originally intended for the uſe of *catechumens*, and uſed at firſt only in the office of Baptiſm.

But the reader, I ſuppoſe, imagines at leaſt that this quæſtion is *of the foundation*; is ſomething, on which *my anſwer* to the Old Whig *depends*; and that, if Mr. *Chandler* has confuted my aſſertion in *this quæſtion*, he has obviated that anſwer; and will be ſurprized perhaps to find the caſe otherwiſe. — Mr. *Chandler* has made great oſtentation, as hath been ſeen, with his long roll of *pretended creeds*, in order to diſprove a point in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, which he has not been able to do.— One would have thought however, that ſomething of conſequence *depended* upon it, and was to be made out from thence, in oppoſition to my anſwer to the *Old Whig*; and therefore it will be worſe ſtill, if, after all, this great *profuſion of learning* ſhould turn out to be *abſolutely inſignificant*; and though he had actually proved that I had been in a miſtake; yet, that my anſwer to the *Old Whig* will ſtand *equally good* — And yet this will appear to be the truth of the caſe.

The *Old Whig* had argued, "that the moſt "ancient creeds of the Chriſtian Church were "*ſhort* and *ſimple*, relating only to thoſe *plain* and

"*neceſſary*

" *neceſſary* articles, on which the *very being* of " Chriſtianity depended, *&c.* from whence he " concluded, that the *explanatory articles* of the " *Church of England*, were a departing from the " *ſimplicity* of the *firſt ages.*"—In anſwer to which, the ſum of what I told him was, " that he " could not argue from the *ancient creeds* of the " Church, to *explanatory articles*; that their *ſeve-* " *ral uſes* was *different*; and therefore, that, tho' " the *ancient creeds* anſwered the *end* for which " *they* were *originally compiled*, though *ſhort* and " *ſimple*; yet, no concluſion could be drawn, " that *explanatory articles*, the *uſe* and *deſign of* " *which* is very *different*, muſt *therefore* be *ſhort* " and *ſimple* likewiſe; becauſe, That might not " anſwer *their* end."——

In ſupport of this I obſerved, that " the *an-* " *cient ſhort* and *ſimple creeds* of the church were " *intended originally*, and *primarily* for the *uſe of* " *catechumens*; and, accordingly, uſed at firſt " only in the office of *Baptiſm* — that the reaſon " of their being *ſhort* and *ſimple* was, that the " *catechumens* might more eaſily retain them in " memory—that they were *inſtructed previouſly* in " the doctrine therein contained; and that the " *creed* was deſigned only as a *ſummary*, or *reca-* " *pitulation* of what they had been taught before " *more at large*—and that therefore, theſe *ancient* " *creeds* of the church, though *ſhort* and *ſimple*, " were *ſufficient* to the *end*, and with great pro- " priety adapted to the uſe, for which they were " *deſigned.*"

But, " that the *end* and *uſe* of *explanatory* " *articles* are very *different.* They are deſigned " to be Teſts of the *qualifications* of thoſe who " offer themſelves to be ordained *Public Teachers* " in the Church, which requires that they ſhould " be *more explicite*; ſince, if *they* were only *ſhort*

" and

" and *ſimple*, and the doctrines expreſſed in *gene-*
" *ral terms*; the perſons who offer themſelves for
" this office, as they may aſſent to theſe articles
" *in appearance*, and yet hold doctrines really *in-*
" *conſiſtent* with the true *intent* and *meaning* of
" them, may thus be admitted to an office,
" which would put it into their power to teach
" and propagate doctrines and opinions, contrary
" to thoſe which they, who are to judge of their
" qualifications, believe to be, according to the
" beſt of their judgment and conſcience, the *true*
" *Scripture-doctrine*—that therefore it did not fol-
" low, that *ſhort* and *ſimple creeds*, though ſuffi-
" cient for the uſe of *catechumens*, which was
" their *original end and uſe*; would be *likewiſe*
" *ſufficient* in *this* caſe, where the *end* is *different*,
" and requires an *explicite* and *explanatory inqui-*
" *ry*[x]."—This is the ſubſtance of my reply to the *Old Whig*; and which I thought ſufficient to ſhew, that there is no arguing from the *ſhort* and *ſimple creeds* of the *ancient Church*, to the *explanatory articles* of the *Church of England*.

THE reader is deſired to obſerve, that the *ſtreſs* of my anſwer to the *Old Whig* is, that there is *no arguing* from the *ancient creeds* of the Church, to our *explanatory articles*.—I obſerved, that he could not juſtly have argued even *from creeds to creeds*.—As *circumſtances* vary, *creeds* muſt do ſo too; not that *articles of faith* vary, or are different in one Church, or at one time, from what they are in another; But time and place, and other circumſtances may render a *more* or *leſs explicite* declaration *proper* and *neceſſary*: And accordingly, *creeds* did in fact *vary*, and *additions* and *explications* were made, in ſome churches *more*, in others *fewer*, according as their *ſeveral ſtates* and *circumſtances* required;

[x] Vide Church of *England* vind. p. 25—32.

required; which is a fact ſo well known, that I ſhall not ſpend time to prove it.

ALTHOUGH the *ancient creeds* of the church therefore, had *not* been *originally* and *primarily* intended for, and uſed by the *candidates for Baptiſm*, but for *all in general*, and even the *candidates for the Miniſtry* (as Mr. *Chandler* has aſſerted) yet he could not argue, from the *ſhortneſs* and *ſimplicity* of the *ancient creeds*, that *therefore creeds now*, and at *all times*, ought to be *ſo too*—he could not argue even *from creeds to creeds*— much leſs could he argue from *thoſe creeds*, to our *explanatory articles*: Becauſe articles, *explanatory* of *creeds*, for the candidates of the *Miniſtry* may be found *neceſſary* in *ſome times* and *ſome circumſtances*, more than in *others*.—It may be judged better to let *creeds* ſtand as they were, and to make the *inquiry* of ſuch candidates by interrogatories, or *explanatory articles*.

SUPPOSING therefore, that Mr. *Chandler* could prove (what he cannot) that the *ancient creeds* of the church were *not originally* intended for, and uſed at firſt only in the office of *Baptiſm*; yet no concluſion will lie from the *nature* of the *ancient creeds*, to what ſhould be the *nature* of our *explanatory articles*: For, though the *former* were *ſhort* and *ſimple*, yet *other times* and *circumſtances* of the church may require even *other creeds*, longer and *more explicite*; much leſs can it be argued that *articles of religion*, deſigned as *explanatory of creeds*, and to guard againſt the admiſſion of perſons into the *miniſtry* who hold falſe and heretical opinions, which *explanatory articles* the *ſtate* and *circumſtances* of the church may require at *one* time more than *another*—much leſs, I ſay, can it be argued from the *ancient ſhort* and *ſimple creeds*, that *ſuch articles* ſhould *not be explanatory* (i. e. ſhould not be *adapted to the end* and *uſe* for which they are *particularly deſigned*) nor *more explicite* than the *creeds*.

And

And therefore, as the *main force* and ſtrength of my *anſwer to the Old Whig* ſtands good, *even ſuppoſing* that the account I had given of the *ancient creeds* of the Church had not been true; it was but *amuſing the reader* to ſingle out *one circumſtance* in the argument, and to ſpend above *thirty pages* in *exhibiting creeds*, alias *private ſentiments*, in order to diſprove a point of fact, which, *though* diſproved, would not take away the *principal force* of the anſwer.—It will indeed have an additional force, as that circumſtance *is true*, and a point of fact which Mr. *Chandler*, with all his ſuperior knowledge in antiquity, is not able to diſprove.

HAVING thus *entertained* his readers with this *collection of creeds*, never, it ſeems, ſeen before, and now ſeen to little purpoſe; he procedes to make his *obſervations* upon them; of which, as far as the merits of the preſent debate are concerned in them, it will be proper to take notice.

1. HE obſerves, that "during the three firſt "centuries of Chriſtianity it doth not appear "that there was any one creed or formulary of "faith *authoriſed* by publick authority, or eſta-"bliſhed *by common conſent* and order of the "church, as the teſt and ſtandard of orthodoxy; "which candidates for the miniſtry were obliged "to declare their aſſent to, as the condition of "their ordination, or which indeed was publick-"ly uſed in any ſolemn ſervices of the Chriſtian "Church or worſhip whatſoever." And in another place he takes notice, that "the truly primi-"tive Fathers had in fact no ſuch common au-"thoritative explanatory creed[y]".

To this obſervation I reply—*Firſt*—that if, in the three firſt centuries, there was not *one creed*, authorized by the *common conſent* of the *univerſal*

T *Church*;

[y] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 122. 140.

Church; it was becauſe *every church* had power and liberty to frame formularies *for the uſe of their own churches*; and to expreſs the articles of the Chriſtian faith, in that way and manner, as *each church* ſaw fit *pro re nata*; and as their *ſtate* and *circumſtances required*; ſo long as they kept to the analogy of faith and doctrine delivered by the Apoſtles: And this ſeems to be the reaſon of ſo many ancient forms, differing in *words*, not in *ſubſtance* [z]. Biſhop *Bull* has ſhewn, that both the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches had their *public creeds* before the *council of Nice*, and from the teſtimony of authors of the *ſecond* and *third century* [a]. And the Author of the *Critical Hiſtory of the Apoſtles*

[z] *Vid. King*'s Critical Hiſtory of the Apoſtles Creed, c. 1. *Bingham*'s Origin. Eccleſ. B. ii. c. 6. ſect. 3. B x. c. 3. ſect. 6. *Grabii* annotata ad *Bulli* Judicium Eccleſ. Cathol. cap. v, vi, vii. §. 13.

[a] Non eſt dubitandum quin eccleſiæ orientales ante Synodum Nicænam ſymbolum ſuum habuerint, ſeu mavis ſymbola ſua; ſymbola volo *latiora* atque *explicatiora* primô illo atque antiquiſſimô ſymbolô, quod *Epiſcopius* commemorat, his tantummodo verbis conceptô: *credo in Deum Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum S.* Namque Romanæ cæteriſque eccleſiis occidentalibus ante concilium Nicænum ſuum fuiſſe ſymbolum, ſimplici illa trinitatis confeſſione majus, non modò ex *Ruffino* et *Auguſtino*, verùm etiam ex *Tertulliano* et *Cypriano*, *tertii ſæculi ſcriptoribus*, ſatis perſpicuum eſt. Ac de Romana quidem eccleſia, quam ſecutæ ſunt fere cæteræ occidentales, expreſſa ſunt verba, à Voſſio citata, *Vigilii* lib. 4. de Eutyche, ubi ſic ſcribit, &c.——Quod ſi verò ante concilium Nicænum tale ſymbolum habuere Romana et occidentis eccleſiæ, quid nî et orientales pariter? Imò hiſce eccleſiis multò magis neceſſarium fuit ejuſmodi ſymbolum, quam eccleſiæ Romanæ, ob cauſam quam ſuprà ex Ruffino attuli; quòd ſcilicet illæ in primis ſæculis miſerè fuerint vexatæ ab hæreticis, qui Romanæ eccleſiæ nullam moleſtiam creârunt. Quin etiam Græci ſcriptores Ante-Nicæni κανόνα τῆς πίστεως, *canonem* ſive *regulam fidei* paſſim in ſcriptis ſuis commemorant. *Irenæus* verò aſianus, et græcis ſcriptoribus procul dubiô annumerandus, regulam illam fuſè tradit, lib. 1. cap. 2. —— Judic. Eccleſ. Cathol. c. vi. §. 2. p. 47, *Edit. Grab.*

ſtles creed, from his review of Antiquity, and his learned, and judicious inquiry concerning that creed, declares his judgment for the uſe of public creeds from the Apoſtles times, in the following words— " Not long after the Apoſtles days, and " even in the apoſtolick age itſelf, ſeveral hereſies " ſprung up in the Church, ſubverſive of the " fundamentals of Chriſtianity, to prevent the " malignant effects whereof *&c.* the Chriſtian " verities oppoſite to thoſe hereſies, were in- " ſerted in the creed; and together with thoſe " other articles, which had without any inter- " miſſion been conſtantly uſed from the time of " the Apoſtles, were propoſed to the aſſent and " belief of *all perſons who came to be baptized* [b].

Irenæus mentions the *canon or rule of faith*, ὁ κανὼν τῆς πίστεως; and though what he gives us, were not indeed, in the form there delivered, the *authorized creeds* of the Church; yet they are the expoſitions of that canon, or rule of faith, which was uſed at *Baptiſm*; of which *Irenæus* ſpeaks: ὁ κανὼν τῆς πίστεως, the rule of faith, or creed, which every Chriſtian, in his time, διὰ τὸ βαπτίσματος εἰληφε, *received at his Baptiſm* [c]: And St. *Cyprian* as expreſsly ſpeaks of the *Symbolum* uſed *at Baptiſm* in his time [d]. The truth is, as Mr. *Bingham* has put it, that, " though the Apoſtles compoſed " no one creed to be of perpetual and *univerſal* " uſe for the *whole Church*, yet it is not to be " doubted but that they uſed *ſome forms* in ad- " mitting catechumens to Baptiſm.— And hence

 " it

[b] Crit. Hiſt. c. 1. p. 38, 39.

[c] L. 1. c. 1.

[d] Quod ſi aliquis illud opponat, ut dicat eandem Novatianum legem tenere, quam catholica eccleſia teneat, *eodem ſymbolo quo & nos baptizare*, &c. ſciat quiſquis hoc opponendum putat, primum, non eſſe unam nobis & ſchiſmaticis *ſymboli legem*, neque *eandem interrogationem*. Epiſt. 69.

" it came to paſs, that there being no *one* certain " form of a creed preſcribed *univerſally* to all " Churches, *every Church* had liberty to frame " *their own creeds*, as they did their own liturgies, " without being tyed preciſely to any one form of " words, ſo long as they kept to the analogy of " faith and doctrine at firſt delivered by the Apo- " ſtles [e]". I would obſerve, that this account, and what is before cited from the *Critical Hiſtory*, are not inconſiſtent with what Mr. *Bingham* and Bp *Pearſon* (cited before in p. 120) have ſaid *viz.* that *Irenæus* is the firſt who ſpeaks of a *formal rule of faith*. For, though the Apoſtles themſelves, and their immediate ſucceſſors, down to *Irenæus*, might, and undoubtedly did, uſe *certain forms* in admitting perſons to Baptiſm, differing in words, though in ſubſtance the ſame; yet *Irenæus* may ſtill be the firſt who *ſpeaks expreſly* of ſuch a *rule of faith*, or delivers any ſuch form, or expoſition of ſuch form; which was reaſon ſufficient for Mr. *Bingham*'s going no higher, in giving a collection of the *remains of the ancient creeds compoſed for the uſe of ſeveral Churches, as we find them preſerved upon record in ancient writers*; in order " to declare what was the *ancient faith* of " the Church [f]."

When Mr. *Chandler* ſays therefore, that " during the three firſt centuries, there was not " any *one creed authoriſed* by *publick authority*, " and order of *the church*—which was publickly " uſed in any ſolemn ſervices of the chriſtian " church"—If he means, that there was not *one*, *common*, *authorized*, *ſtandard creed*, uſed by the *univerſal church*, in any of their ſervices; it is an *obſerva-*

[e] Origin Eccleſ. B. x. C. 3. Sect. 6.

[f] Bingh. Origin. Eccleſ. B. x. C. iv. Sect. i.

obſervation to little purpoſe: And if he means, that *particular churches* had not their *ſeveral forms*, which they made uſe of in any of their public ſervices; the contrary appears to be true—*Irenæus*, and *Cyprian*, writers of the *ſecond* and *third* centuries, Both expreſsly ſpeak of a *canon* or *ſymbol of faith* uſed at *Baptiſm*; which ſurely is one of the *ſolemn ſervices of the church*; Biſhop *Bull* ſhews, that the *Roman* and *Weſtern* churches had their creeds, from the writers of the *third century*; and he looks upon it as paſt doubt, that the *oriental* churches had alſo theirs, before the *council of Nice*, founded upon the ſubſtantial reaſons he gives, in what I have before cited from him, and upon the teſtimony of *Irenæus*, of the *ſecond century*: And Mr. *Bingham*, and the author of the *critical hiſtory* (as before cited) give their judgment upon this point, that from the apoſtles times downwards, the *ſeveral churches* had *their formularies*, which they framed for themſelves, as their ſeveral ſtates and circumſtances required, and which were *publickly uſed* in one of the moſt ſolemn offices of the church, namely at *Baptiſm*.—Mr. *Chandler* ſays, that "though *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Novatian*, and "others of the Fathers call their creeds *the rule of* "*faith*, yet they do not mean, that the *particular* "*creeds* or formularies *they have given us* were *au-*"*thoriſed* and *eſtabliſhed* as *ſtandards of faith*[b]."—May be not; But if they ſpeak nevertheleſs *expreſsly* of a *rule of faith* uſed at *Baptiſm* (as we have ſeen that *Irenæus* and *Cyprian* do) though the creeds they afterwards deliver were not *that expreſs form*; yet it is plain evidence however, that *ſome form* was *uſed at Baptiſm*; which is ſufficient to overturn Mr. *Chandler*'s *obſervation* above-mentioned.

AGAIN

[b] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 123.

AGAIN—He tells us, that "*Du Pin* ſays, "the phraſe *rule of faith*, doth not mean a *ſet* "*form* of faith, but the *faith itſelf*[i]." But let *Du Pin* ſay what he pleaſes; he cannot make the reader, I ſuppoſe, believe, that when *Irenæus expreſsly ſpeaks* of a *canon* or *rule of faith* which every chriſtian *received at Baptiſm*; and when *Cyprian* as *expreſsly* tells us of the *ſymbol* or *creed uſed at Baptiſm*; neither *Du Pin*, nor Mr. *Chandler* will be able to make the reader believe, that becauſe the *rule of faith* means the *faith itſelf*, therefore the *faith itſelf* was not compriſed in ſome *form*, ſome *canon*, or *ſymbol* which was *uſed at Baptiſm*; againſt the *expreſs evidence* of the Fathers abovementioned: And if not, *Du Pin*'s account of the meaning of the phraſe, *rule of faith*, is of as little conſequence in the preſent quæſtion, as Mr. *Chandler*'s quoting it is.

ONCE more—"*Du Pin* himſelf (he ſays) ac- "knowledges, that in the ſecond and third ages "of the church, we find as many creeds as au- "thors, and the ſame author ſets the creed down "after a different manner in ſeveral places of his "works, which plainly ſhews"—Now for a conſequence—"which plainly ſhews"—what? why, "that there was not then at leaſt any creed that "was reputed *to be the Apoſtles*[k]." What is this to the purpoſe? But does this *variety of creeds*, which *Du Pin* mentions, *plainly ſhew* that there were, in theſe ages, no creeds or formularies of faith at all uſed in the churches? or does it not rather much more *plainly ſhew* the truth of the account which Mr. *Bingham*, and the author of the *critical hiſtory* give; *viz.* that each church had a liberty of framing formularies for their own uſe; and that theſe differing creeds, which *Du Pin* mentions,

[i] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 123.
[k] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 123, 124.

mentions, were moſt probably the expoſitions of ſuch formularies ſo uſed.—But Mr. *Chandler* has another *conſequence* to draw upon us, from this variety of creeds, as good as the former; for *Du Pin*, it ſeems, likewiſe ſays, that it "*plainly* "*ſhews*, that there was not any regulated and "ESTABLISHED FORM of faith [l]."—*Where*—(for I am by no means frighten'd by the *eſtabliſhed form* being printed in *capitals*)—*Where* does this variety of creeds plainly ſhew that there was not any *regulated* and *eſtabliſhed form?*—Does he mean, *one eſtabliſhed form* of the *univerſal church?* It may ſhew that, and welcome, I have nothing to do with it; But if he thinks it ſhews, that there were no formularies of faith framed, and uſed at *Baptiſm*, even in the apoſtolical times, and after, by *particular churches*, which is the only quæſtion here concerned; the reader, I ſuppoſe, is ſatisfied by this time, that it ſhews no ſuch thing. Dr. *Grabe*, on the contrary, was of opinion, that this *variety of creeds*, or expoſitions of creeds, differing in words and phraſes yet agreeing in the ſubſtance of faith, was a proof that there was ſome traditionary creed from whence this agreement flowed; which otherwiſe, he thinks, could never have happened: And that this variety in words and phraſes, was occaſioned by this creed not having been written in paper and ink, but in the table of the heart; whence it was lawful to *each church*, to expreſs the *ſenſe* of it in *what words they ſhould judge moſt proper* [m].

"'Tis to be hoped therefore, (concludes Mr. "*Chandler*) that the champion, or ſome of his "friends for him, will inform the world what "creeds

[l] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 124.

[m] Grabii Annotata ad Bulli Judic. Eccleſ. Cathol. cap. v, vi, vii. §. 13.

" creeds he means, which he talks of as *the moſt* " *ancient ones*, and which with great aſſurance he " appropriates to the uſe of baptiſm [n]." I anſwer, once for all, that I mean thoſe ancient, ſhort, and ſimple ſummaries of faith, which the *Apoſtles* uſed; the creeds, which *Irenæus* and *Cyprian* mention to have been in uſe at the admiſſion of perſons to *Baptiſm* in the *ſecond* and *third* centuries; the ſummaries or formularies, which Biſhop *Bull* ſhews to have been made the ſame uſe of in the ſame ages, both in the *eaſtern* and *weſtern* churches; the ſame kind of ſummaries, which Mr. *Bingham* has given us the remains or expoſitions of; and which he, and the author of the *critical hiſtory*, and every body elſe who has conſidered theſe things, know that each particular church, in thoſe and the following centuries, framed for their ſeveral reſpective uſes as their circumſtances required, and made uſe of by propoſing them to the aſſent of all perſons who came to be baptized.—Theſe are the *ancient creeds* I ſpeak of; and of which I have aſſerted what gives Mr. *Chandler* ſo much offence; that they were *originally intended* for that uſe, and were therefore ſhort and ſimple.

In few words, the caſe concerning creeds was this. That creeds were, in their *original* and *primary intention* and uſe, deſigned for the *candidates of Baptiſm*, is ſo evident, that the *moſt ancient* took *their riſe* from the *form* of Baptiſm (as hath been before obſerved) and probably contained little, if any thing more. But the hereſies, which ſoon aroſe, did not ſuffer the church long to uſe *ſo ſhort and ſimple a form* and confeſſion. Various were the heretics; who even in the Apoſtles times endeavoured to corrupt the principal articles of the

[n] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 124.

the Chriſtian faith; and after the death of the Apoſtles, began to ſpread and propagate their opinions: This made it neceſſary for the Biſhops or governors of the ſeveral churches to frame *larger confeſſions* or forms of faith, and to require aſſent to them from the *catechumens*, or thoſe who offered for Baptiſm. The *Eaſtern* Churches were at firſt chiefly diſturbed by theſe hereſies; which occaſioned the *firſt inlargement* of the creed to be in *thoſe churches*; and the additions which were made to the firſt and moſt ſimple form by the *Eaſtern* Churches, were for the moſt part received afterwards by the *Roman* and *Weſtern* Churches into their confeſſions; the *original* and *primary uſe* of all which creeds, were in admitting perſons to *Baptiſm*: And though the *baptiſmal creeds* were inlarged from time to time, on the accounts above-mentioned; yet the uſe they were intended for (*viz.* the ſimple confeſſion of ſome of the chief fundamental doctrines, in oppoſition to heretical opinions, by the candidates of Baptiſm) did not require ſo *explicite* an account as was, and is neceſſary to be expected, from the candidates for the office of *public teachers*.—This account of creeds I take upon me to deliver as juſtifiable from a view of Antiquity, and as the opinion of learned men in this quæſtion. —Theſe creeds, or creed, from time to time inlarged, down from the age of the Apoſtles, were the *creeds I ſpake of* as *originally* and *primarily intended* for the *uſe of catechumens*, and as firſt uſed only in the office of Baptiſm: And if the reader ſhall prefer Dr. *Grabe*'s opinion; who, though he undertakes not to defend the account of *Ruffinus*, that the Apoſtles themſelves actually compoſed the creed at once, which goes under their name; and rejects the ſtory of the twelve Apoſtles throwing in each of them their article; yet endeavours to prove, that all the articles of that creed,

except the *communion of ſaints*, the *church*, and *Chriſt's deſcent into hell*, were expreſſed by the primitive Chriſtians in their ſolemn confeſſions of faith, in the *age*, and *by the authority or approbation, of the Apoſtles themſelves*.°—If the reader, I ſay, ſhall prefer this opinion, to that which is more generally received; that this creed was inlarging, and received not it's completion, 'till 400 years after Chriſt; he may then look upon this creed in particular, ſo far, as one of the creeds I ſpake of.—And now Mr. *Chandler* may go tell his learned friends, that *Du Pin* ſays, that during the three firſt centuries there was no *regulated* ESTABLISHED FORM *of faith*; and when he has done, they will probably tell him, if they are indeed *learned friends*, that, if he means hereby, that there was no *one ſtandard creed* of the *univerſal church*; it is nothing to the purpoſe: And if he means, that *particular churches* did not *frame their own creeds*, keeping to the analogy of faith, and *originally* and *primarily make uſe* of them in their admiſſion of perſons to *Baptiſm*; that he is miſtaken, that he has *waded out of his depth*, and that the whole ſtream of Antiquity runs againſt him.

Secondly.—But he ſays, that "during the three "firſt centuries, there was not *any one creed* or "formulary of faith authoriſed by public autho- "rity of the church, *which candidates for the Mi- "niſtry were obliged to declare their aſſent to*, as "the condition of their ordination".—1. Now what does this prove, in the preſent quæſtion about an *explanatory inquiry* on ſuch occaſions? Suppoſe there was no authorized *creed*, either of the univerſal church, or in particular churches, for the examination of the candidates for the Miniſtry; does

° *Vid.* Grabii Annot. ad Bull. Judic. Eccleſ. Cathol. c. v, vi, vii.

does it thence follow, that they were examined by *mere Scripture-words* only?—This may be one of Mr. *Chandler*'s conſequences, of which kind we have had many in the courſe of this debate; But I aſſure him I admit none ſuch, and muſt expect ſome farther proof of it—A ſtrong preſumptive one ſtands againſt him—We have ſeen, that each particular church had always a liberty of compoſing formularies for their own uſe and direction: *Tertullian*, of the *ſecond* century, informs us that they were not tied up to *Scripture-words*, even in the examination at *Baptiſm*; For he ſays, that "the "reſponſes then to be made by the baptized "perſons, were larger than what is laid down in "the Scriptures[p]:" And Mr. *Chandler* obſerves, that, "during theſe primitive times there were many "real hereſies, againſt which the men of learning "and ability in the church oppoſed themſelves, "in order to preſerve the unity and purity of the "Chriſtian faith—when numerous hereſies abound-"ed in it, that ſtruck at the very foundations of "Chriſtianity[q]."—Now, in ſuch times and ſuch circumſtances; when *numerous hereſies abounded* in the church, which *ſtruck at the very foundations of Chriſtianity*; and when each church thought themſelves at liberty to *frame their own formularies for their own uſe*; and did not think themſelves tied down to *Scripture-words* even in the examination for *Baptiſm*; can any man, who will conſult his reaſon inſtead of his prejudices, ſeriouſly affirm that he believes, that theſe governors of the church, theſe *men of learning and ability*, who *oppoſed themſelves to theſe hereſies*, in order to *preſerve*

[p] Dehinc ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid reſpondentes quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit.—Tertull. de Coron. c. iii. p. 102.

[q] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 132, 141.

the unity and purity of the Chriſtian faith, would admit perſons into the *Miniſtry*, into the important office of *Public Teachers*, upon their aſſent to the *mere words of Scripture*; when many of theſe *numerous heretics* might aſſent to *Scripture-words*, and yet, by their interpretation of them, might hold *opinions* repugnant to the *true Scripture-faith* —Would this be a likely way to *preſerve the unity and purity of the Chriſtian faith?* Or can it be rationally ſuppoſed, that they, who thought it their duty to *oppoſe theſe hereſies*, to *preſerve the unity and purity of the Chriſtian faith*, and to *prevent theſe hereſies from being ſpread and propagated* among their people; would acquieſce in admitting perſons to the office of *Public Teachers* by ſuch a rule of examination, as would admit *every heretic* who would aſſent to the *mere words of Scripture*; when at the ſame time they knew that theſe men, tho' they ſhould aſſent to the *words* of Scripture, might nevertheleſs hold, and did hold, opinions which *ſtruck at the very foundations of Chriſtianity*; and would thereby be admitted into ſuch offices, as would enable them to ſpread their hereſies, to corrupt the people, and deſtroy, as much as in them lay, the *unity and purity of the Chriſtian faith*—Theſe are ſuppoſitions, the improbability and abſurdity of which, None, who are not blinded by an inveterate prejudice, but muſt ſee; or who are not hardened by a more inveterate obſtinacy, but muſt admit.— 2. When he ſays, that *there was not any one creed authorized by public authority of the church*, for the examination of candidates for the Miniſtry. —Does he mean, authorized by the *univerſal church?* If he does, this does not prove that *particular churches* had not their *reſpective formularies* for *ſuch examinations*; any more than there not having been *any one creed* authorized by the *univerſal church* for *examining the candidates for Baptiſm*,

tiſm, proves that *each particular church* had not *its proper creed* for *that purpoſe*. On the contrary, as there not having been *one creed* of the *univerſal church* for *Baptiſm*, was the very reaſon that *each church* had liberty to *frame their own creeds for this uſe*, according to their ſeveral circumſtances; ſo the caſe might be the ſame, and probably was the ſame, in the *forms of examining the candidates for the Miniſtry*.—That 'tis highly improbable they would examine by the *mere words of Scripture*, when they had been abuſed by falſe and heretical gloſſes and interpretations, has been before ſhewn; and it is as highly reaſonable to conclude, that in ſuch caſes, they would not think an examination by ſuch ſhort and ſimple formularies as *baptiſmal creeds*, to be ſufficient; but would expect a more *explicite account* from the *candidates for the Miniſtry*; and think it neceſſary to diſcover, whether they held, not only the fundamental doctrines of Chriſtianity expreſſed in *general terms*, but in ſuch terms as might diſcover whether they held theſe *general doctrines* in their *true intent* and meaning, as *oppoſed to the hereſies* which Mr. *Chandler* owns to have then *abounded*; before they would admit them to the important office of *Public Teachers* in the Church. And this is the more probable, ſince we find *Irenæus* complaining expreſsly, that the heretics *equivocated with the creed*, probably the baptiſmal creed, then in uſe[r].—Theſe, I hope, the reader will look upon to be rational concluſions; and if he does, he will at the ſame time be ſatisfied, that all Mr. *Chandler's talk* about *no creed* to examine by, is nothing better than evaſion; concluding nothing againſt an *explanatory inquiry*, or for examination by *Scripture-words* only on ſuch occa-

[r] Ὁμοια μὲν λαλυσιν, ἀνομοια δ' φρονυσιν. *Iren.* Proœm.

occaſions, in the Church either ancient or modern.

2. ANOTHER *obſervation* is, that "the primitive creeds, ſuch of them as are left on record, "were *ſhort and ſimple* [s]."——Very true, and I have aſſigned the reaſon for it, *viz.* their having been *originally intended* for the *uſe of catechumens* in Baptiſm.—Mr. *Chandler* ſays, "the very contrary may be proved from Antiquity [t]".—Why has he not produced ſuch proof then? For what he has hitherto ſaid, proves nothing about it. "The moſt ancient creeds (ſays he) were unqueſtionably thoſe we have in Scripture, and "thoſe which the primitive Fathers have left in "their writings, which I have tranſlated [u]".—— Thoſe which *he has tranſlated* and *added to Mr. Bingham's collection*, are *not creeds at all*, ever compoſed for public uſe: So far from it, that he himſelf tells us in another place, that "all the "creeds *he has tranſlated* are only *mere private* "*compoſitions*, without having the *ſanction of any* "*particular churches*, much leſs of the *univerſal* "*church* [x]." Theſe therefore are ſo far from being the *moſt ancient* creeds, that they are *no creeds at all*. Indeed they are no more than occaſional diſcourſes, from which we may gather the *ancient faith*; and were no creeds, nor delivered as ſuch; which Mr. *Chandler* owns: And if the reader would be informed, why he owns, in one place, thoſe paſſages to be *only mere private compoſitions*, which in another he affirms to be, and cites as, *ancient creeds of the Church*; the only account I can give of it is, that it was to *ſerve a turn*, and *for his purpoſe*. To ſay therefore (as if it was ſaying ſomething of mighty conſequence) that—

"Now

[s] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 125, 127. [t] Ibid. p. 141.
[u] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 141. [x] Ibid. p. 122.

" Now *it doth not appear*, that any one of *theſe* " was *originally* framed *only* for the *candidates at* " *Baptiſm* [y]," is really what every reader ought to reſent, as a contempt put upon his underſtanding.——Pray Sir, *doth it appear* that any one of *theſe* were creeds *ever uſed at Baptiſm at all?* If not, you know they are not the creeds I was ſpeaking of, as *originally* framed for that uſe.—— And if thoſe which *you have tranſlated* are *no creeds of any church*, nor *ever uſed at Baptiſm at all*; it is no wonder, I ſuppoſe, that *it doth not appear* that *any of them* were *originally* framed *only* for *that uſe*. Mr. *Chandler*'s argument, when put together in due form, is this.—" It may be proved from Anti- " quity, that the *public creeds of the Church* were not " *originally* intended for the uſe of catechumens, nor " uſed at firſt only in the office of Baptiſm."—— Why? — " Becauſe *it doth not appear*, that *any* " *of the mere private compoſitions*, which were *no* " *public creeds of any Church* (but which never- " theleſs *I have tranſlated*, and called the *moſt* " *ancient* creeds, to ſerve a turn; though indeed, " to ſerve another, I have *contradicted my ſelf*, by " owning, in other places, that they are *not creeds* " but *private compoſitions*) nor *ever uſed* or *framed* " *for Baptiſm*, or any other *public uſe* of the " church *at all*; were *originally* framed only for " Baptiſm." — If Mr. *Chandler*'s learned friends are contented to take this for *proving* any thing from Antiquity, or for *reaſoning* or *argument*, or for any thing but bold aſſertions and low fallacies, the *Caſe of Subſcription* is calculated for them, and I wiſh them joy of it with all my heart!——As to what he has tranſlated in common with Mr. *Bingham*; That cited from the *Apoſtolical conſtitutions*, is particularly there *appropriated to Baptiſm*,

[y] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 141.

tiſm, as hath been ſhewn. As to the others, the *Canon* or *Symbol*, mentioned by *Irenæus* and *Cyprian*, are indeed mentioned as *baptiſmal creeds*; and the reſt of Mr. *Bingham's collection*, from *Irenæus*, 'till he comes to give the more *perfect forms* of the creed, are ſaid to be the *ſcattered remains* of the *creeds of the ſeveral churches*: But then, the ancient *baptiſmal creeds*, of which theſe were the *remains* (or perhaps *expoſitions*) and the *canon* or *ſymbol* before mentioned; as they were *uſed* at Baptiſm, ſo were *originally framed for that uſe*, as hath been before obſerved.

3. THE only remaining *obſervation* which I think my ſelf concerned to take notice of, is, that "not one of the primitive Fathers ſpeaks of *one* "*creed* for the *Candidates for Baptiſm*, and *an*-"*other* for *Chriſtians in general*, and a *third* for "the *Candidates for the Miniſtry*[z]."—Who ſaid they did? The ancient *creeds*, which were only ſhort and ſimple ſummaries, I have all along repreſented as *originally uſed only at Baptiſm*; and which did not make a part of the daily ſervice of the Church, nor were uſed publicly by *all Chriſtians*, 'till the Vth *century*. And as theſe creeds were made ſhort and ſimple, on account of this their *original uſe*; to which uſe and end, ſhort and ſimple creeds, containing the main ſtamina and fundamentals of Chriſtianity, were ſufficient (the catechumens being otherwiſe previouſly inſtructed more at large); no argument can be drawn from theſe, either by the *Old Whig* or Mr. *Chandler*, that the examination or inquiry into the faith of the candidates for the office of *Public Teachers*, ſhould be as *ſhort* and *ſimple* as *baptiſmal creeds*.—The quæſtion therefore is not, whether there was one *creed* for the candidates of Baptiſm, and another

[z] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 143.

other *creed* for the candidates of the Miniſtry (which is mere ſhuffle and evaſion) but, whether it is not reaſonable to believe, that, in the primitive ages as well as in the preſent, there was not a *difference* obſerved in the examination of the *Candidates for Baptiſm*, and the examination of *Candidates for the Miniſtry*; and whether a *more explicite account* of their faith was not required from the *latter*, than from the *former*.— If the affirmative can be made expreſsly appear from the primitive ages of the church, and thoſe the moſt ancient, even the apoſtolical ages themſelves; then the authority for continuing the like practice (whether by explanatory creeds, or any other explanatory inquiry, it matters not) will be ſufficiently vindicated. —— Let us ſee then how this matter ſtands.

When *Philip* baptized the *Æthiopian* Eunuch, he required no other declaration of him, ſo far as appears, than that he *believed Jeſus Chriſt to be the Son of God* [a].

When *Ananias* baptized St. *Paul*, it was required only that he ſhould call on the name of the Lord, ἐπικαλεσαμενος το ὀνομα του Κυριου [b]; that is, ſhould *profeſs the name of Jeſus Chriſt*, or declare himſelf to be a Chriſtian; equivalent to *Philip*'s demand of the Eunuch, that he ſhould believe Jeſus to be the Son of God.

So again *Peter*, on the day of Pentecoſt, when he baptized thoſe preſent, who aſked, *what ſhall we do?* bids them *repent, and be baptized*, ἐπι τω ὀνοματι Ἰησου Χριστου εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιων [c].

This confeſſion then, or the like, was all that appears to have been required by the Apoſtles, and immediate meſſengers of our Lord, as previouſly

[a] Acts viii. 37, 38. [b] Acts xxii. 16.
[c] Acts ii. 38.

neceſſary to *Baptiſm.*—But do they appear to have required *no more* from the *candidates of the Miniſtry*, than *ſuch plain and ſimple confeſſions?*— Let us review their *directions* upon this head.

When St. *Paul* directs *Timothy* to "commit "the doctrine to faithful men [πιστοις ανθρωποις, to "men *found in the faith*] who ſhall be able [ικανοι, "fit, proper, or duly qualified] to teach others[d]," *i. e.* to admit none into the office of the miniſtry, or, of Public Teachers in the Chriſtian Church, but perſons ſo qualified—When St. *Paul* gave this direction, did he mean to direct *Timothy*, to ordain ſuch who ſhould profeſs their belief in ſuch *general terms* only, as that "Jeſus Chriſt is the "Son of God;" or, upon their "*profeſſing only* "*the name of Jeſus Chriſt*, for the remiſſion of "ſins?"—If ſo, then, as St. *Paul*'s direction, will make no difference between the *inquiry* into the faith of the *candidates for the Miniſtry*, and the *candidates for Baptiſm*; it will only be telling *Timothy*, that all who, in point of faith, are qualified for *Baptiſm*, or merely to be admitted as *Chriſtians*; are qualified, are fit and proper to be admitted as *Public Teachers* in the Church, and without any more explicite account of their faith.—— But will any man ſeriouſly ſay, that he believes this to have been St. *Paul*'s meaning? and that, by ικανοι και ετερους διδαξαι, *men fit and qualified to teach and inſtruct* others in the *whole faith of the goſpel* (for that is the office of a Public Teacher in the Church) he underſtood only, men who ſhould be *qualified for Baptiſm*, by making the *ſhort* and *ſimple baptiſmal profeſſion* of *Jeſus being the Son of God*, or the *Meſſiah?*— Does St. *Paul* ſay, "or- "dain ſuch as are qualified in the faith for *Bap-* "*tiſm?*" (yet, he had no occaſion to have ſaid more,

[d] 2 Tim. ii. 2.

more, if the account of the faith required for *Baptiſm*, and the *Miniſtry*, were one and the ſame) No; but, "ſuch as are *qualified to teach* and in-"ſtruct the people in all the doctrines of the "Goſpel;" which ſurely carries more in it, and authorizes a more explicite inquiry, than whether they are *qualified* for *Baptiſm*; or fit merely to be admitted as *Chriſtians*, by the profeſſion of one or two fundamentals, which were thought ſufficient qualifications for the *mere admiſſion* into the *Chriſtian Covenant*.—Will Mr. *Chandler* ſay, that St. *Paul* would have thought the Eunuch, baptized by *Philip* upon his confeſſing *Jeſus to be the Son of God*, to have been thereby qualified alſo to have been *ordained a Public Teacher* in the Chriſtian Church? and yet it muſt be ſo, if the ſame confeſſion of faith, or the ſame creed which was thought a ſufficient qualification for *Baptiſm*, was always (as Mr. *Chandler* maintains) eſteemed a ſufficient qualification alſo for ordination to the *Miniſtry*.

THE ſame may be ſaid of St. *Paul*'s account of the *qualifications* of a *Biſhop*; who, among others, muſt have That of being *apt to teach*; διδακτικὸν[c], qualified to teach, well inſtructed in the whole doctrine of the Goſpel.—Is this no more than is required from a *candidate for Baptiſm?* no more than *Philip* required from the Eunuch?—Theſe, and the like directions, are ſufficient to ſhew the *difference* made, even in the apoſtolic age, between that qualification (in point of faith and knowledge of the Goſpel) which was looked upon as ſufficient, previous to the *firſt* and *ſimple admiſſion into the Chriſtian Covenant* by *Baptiſm*; and that qualification, which was eſteemed neceſſary for ſuch perſons who were to be admitted to the great and *important office*, of *teaching*

[c] 1 Tim. iii. 2.

and *inſtructing* mankind in *all* the doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion.

Mr. *Chandler* ſays, that " the truth of the " matter is this: that in the truly primitive times, " when there was no ſet *regulated formulary* of " faith, which was the *authoritative* common " *ſtandard* of the *Chriſtian Church*, every church " made uſe of ſuch ſhort and plain forms as they " thought moſt proper, and as their own cir- " cumſtances rendered neceſſary, *&c.*[f]—I muſt tell Mr. *Chandler* once again, that, whether there was or was not any authoritative common ſtandard creed of the *univerſal Church*, it matters not; if there were (and, by the way, he here allows there were) forms or creeds made uſe of by *every particular church*, and drawn up in ſuch terms as they thought moſt proper, and as their own circumſtances rendered neceſſary.

But here again he repeats his obſervation, that " they had not different creeds for different " purpoſes, or one for the candidates for Baptiſm, " and another for thoſe who were candidates for " the Miniſtry;" and " ſee, reader, (ſays he) in " the ancient times, there was only one ſhort and " plain creed, for Catechumens, baptized perſons, " Preſbyters, and Biſhops[g]."—*Where* is the reader to look, in order to *ſee this?* Mr. *Chandler* will tell him.—" In the letter, (ſays he) that *Euſebius*, " biſhop of *Cæſarea*, wrote to the people of that " city, he incloſed the creed that I have before " tranſlated, and prefaces it in this manner: *The* " *written formulary which I preſented*, &c. *was* " *this*; *even as we have received it from the Biſhops* " *before us, and when we were firſt catechiſed, and* " *when we were baptized, and as we have learnt* " *from*

[f] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 144.
[g] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 143, 144.

"*from the ſacred Scriptures, and as we have be-*
"*lieved and taught when we were Preſbyters, and*
"*even ſince we have been Biſhops.* See, reader, in
"the ancient times, there was only one ſhort and
"plain creed, for Catechumens, baptized perſons,
"Preſbyters, and Biſhops [h]."—I fancy the reader will *ſee here* not quite ſo much as Mr. *Chandler* would have him. It will appear that this quotation from *Euſebius*, does by no means prove That for which Mr. *Chandler* has produced it. It proves no more than that this formulary contained, according to *Euſebius*, the *ſubſtance of the* true *faith*, that had been profeſſed by Catechumens, baptized perſons, Preſbyters, and Biſhops. It proves nothing about *one* and the *ſame creed* uſed for them all; or, indeed, of *any* creed uſed for *any* of them; and the reader will find, when he conſiders what this *formulary of Euſebius* is, that he neither did, nor could intend to ſay any ſuch thing as Mr. *Chandler* makes him ſay.—This formulary then, the reader is to know, was compoſed partly of the *creed then in uſe*, and partly of *additions* and *explications*, which *Euſebius*, who delivered it in to the *Council of Nice*, as the confeſſion of his faith, then inſerted, in order to clear himſelf of the errors which had been laid to his charge (as hath been before remarked [i]) and which *formulary* underwent ſtill *farther changes* and *additions*, before it was allowed by the *Council* [k].—This *formulary* then, which *Euſebius* ſays was preſented by him to the *Council*, he could never intend, in the *preface* Mr. *Chandler* has quoted from him, to ſay, was (as it there ſtands) the *one plain creed*, which had been uſed for *Catechumens*, *Preſbyters*, and *Biſhops:*

[h] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 143. [i] Vid. p. 119.
[k] Euſeb. Epiſt. ad Cæſar. apud Socrat. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. viii. Theodoret. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 1. c. xii.

ſhops: Becauſe, in fact, *that formulary* had *never been ſo uſed*; as it conſiſted of a *mixture* of his own, then purpoſely inſerted on the account above-mentioned—He could therefore mean no more, than that the *formulary*, incloſed in his letter to the people of *Cæſarea*, contained the *true faith*, which had been received and delivered down by the *Biſhops before him*, and which was the faith profeſſed by *Catechumens*, *&c.* This will ſtill appear more plainly from examining the paſſage itſelf, which, for that purpoſe, I ſhall here ſet down.—το μεν εν παρ' ημων γεγραμμα, επι παρουσια τε θεοφιλεστατε ημων Βασιλεως, αναγνωσθεν, ευ τε εχειν κ) δοκιμως αποφανθεν, τυτον εχει τον τροπον· καθως παρελαβομεν παρα των προ ημων επισκοπων, κ) εν τη κατηχησει, κ) ὁτε το λεγειν ελαμβανομεν, κ) καθως απο των θειων γραφων μεμαθηκαμεν, κ) ως ἐν τω πρεσβυτερειω, κ) εν αυτη τη επισκοπη επιστευσαμεν τε κ) εδιδασκομεν.

Now, in the firſt place it is obſervable, that *Euſebius* does not here ſay, that he *received this formulary* from the Biſhops before him; but only, Καθως παρελαβομεν παρα των, *&c.* not, "as we have "received it," that *particular formulary* (as Mr. *Chandler* tranſlates) but, καθως παρελαβομεν, *as* we *have received*, or, *according to what we have received* (or, *have learned*, *have been taught*) from the Biſhops before us; Και εν τη κατηχησει, and *according to what we received*, or *were taught*, when Catechumens, *&c.* That this is the meaning of καθως here, is plain from what follows, και καθως απο των θειων γραφων μεμαθηκαμεν, *&c.*—What! did *Euſebius* intend to acquaint the people of *Cæſarea*, that he had learned *that very formulary* from the *Scriptures?* No; but that it was *agreeable* to what *they had learned* from, or *contained the faith* of, the Scriptures; and therefore in the ſame ſenſe is καθως παρελαβομεν to be underſtood, *viz.* that this *formulary* was (not that *formulary*, that *creed* which they had

had received, but) *agreeable to*, or *according to* the *faith and doctrine*, which they had *received* from the Biſhops before them, and when Catechumens, baptized perſons, Preſbyters, and Biſhops. This is the plain meaning of the *Author*—The meaning of the *Tranſlator* is, I hope, as plain too. καθως παρελαβομεν, is here rendered by Mr. *Chandler*, " as we have received *it*;" by which the *Engliſh* reader was to underſtand *Euſebius* to have here ſaid, that they had received *that formulary*, in the words then delivered by *Euſebius*, from the Biſhops before him; and that *that very formulary* was what had been uſed for Catechumens, and at the office of Baptiſm, *&c.*— But this too, I ſuppoſe, was deſigned for thoſe, *who have neither leiſure nor learning to conſult the originals.*

So again—*Euſebius* does not ſay, that this was the very *formulary uſed* by them when Preſbyters and Biſhops; but, ως επιστευσαμεν τε και εδιδαχθημεν, *as we have believed* and *taught*, *i. e.* that this formulary was agreeable to, or, was the *ſubſtance of the faith*, ſo taught and believed.

In the next place I muſt obſerve, that, ſuppoſing *Euſebius* to have been here ſpeaking *ſtrictly of this formulary*, *viz.* that it was the *very formulary* uſed by them when Preſbyters and Biſhops; yet, he does not ſay, that it was the formulary uſed for their *examination* at the *ordination* of Preſbyters and Biſhops; but, the formulary according to which they *believed* and *taught*, or, the formulary which they *uſed*, εν τω πρεσβυτερειω, και εν αυτη τη επισκοπη, *when they were Preſbyters*, and *even ſince they had been Biſhops*—ſo that, at the moſt, here is no evidence that this was the *formulary* uſed in the *examination* at *ordination*, or of the *candidates for the Miniſtry.*

If then this formulary of *Euſebius*, as it there ſtands, neither was, nor is delivered by him as, the

the *one creed* which was uſed alike for catechumens, baptized perſons, and for the *examination* of *Preſbyters* and *Biſhops* at their *ordination*, (for which Mr. *Chandler* has been *ſhuffling* it into the hands of the reader) but is delivered only by *Euſebius* as what *contained*, or was *agreeable to*, the *ancient* and *conſtant faith* of the Church; then, no more is proved from hence, than that there was, in thoſe times, only *one faith* for Catechumens, Preſbyters, and Biſhops: But, that *one* and the *ſame formulary of examination*, equally explicite, was alike uſed for them all, is not proved from what *Euſebius* hath related concerning this formulary; which, as delivered by *Euſebius*, was not at *that time*, nor *afterwards*, without *alterations* and *additions*, the *creed* of *any church*, nor uſed *either* for *Catechumens*, *Preſbyters*, or *Biſhops*; and therefore, that it was at that time, *uſed alike for them all*, is to be aſcribed only to the *inventive genius* of Mr. *Chandler*.

THEREFORE, even ſuppoſing *Euſebius* to have been here ſpeaking of the *creed*, *then in uſe* in the Church, without any additions of his own; and not only of the *ſubſtance of faith*, but of *that very formulary*; and that even *that very formulary* was the *one only creed uſed* for Catechumens, baptized perſons, Preſbyters, and Biſhops; yet, were all this true (as there is not one word of it ſo) ſtill it will not appear from hence to be any ſupport to the *main point* which Mr. *Chandler* is to make out, *viz.* that there was *no difference made* in the *inquiry* into the *faith*, of the *candidates for Baptiſm*, and of the *candidates for the Miniſtry*.—For, may we not ſay, as truly, the very ſame things of the *Apoſtles Creed*, as *Euſebius* has ſaid of *his formulary*?—Is it not equally true of the *Apoſtles Creed*, that we "re-"ceived it from the Biſhops before us, and when "we were firſt catechiſed, and when we were "baptized,

" baptized, and as we have learned from the ſa-
" cred ſcriptures, and as we have believed and
" taught, when we were Preſbyters, and even ſince
" we have been Biſhops."—And might I not here, according to Mr. *Chandler*'s way of drawing conſequences, call out with him, in the ſame ſtrain; See, reader, in the *Church of England* there is *only one ſhort* and *plain Creed* for *Catechumens*, *baptized Perſons*, *Preſbyters*, and *Biſhops!*—Yet, would this be any proof that there is *no difference* in the *inquiry* made at *Baptiſm*, and at *Ordination?* Mr. *Chandler* knows, to his ſorrow, that it would not: And therefore, neither will what *Euſebius* ſays, prove the ſame of the times he is ſpeaking of.—For, ſuppoſe that the *creed* uſed at Baptiſm, and at Ordination, in the primitive ages, was *one and the ſame*; does it follow therefore, that there was not a *more explicite inquiry* made at *Ordination*, than there was at *Baptiſm?* The *creed uſed* might be the *ſame*; But there might nevertheleſs ſtill be a *more explicite inquiry* added to the creed at *Ordination*, than what was thought neceſſary at *Baptiſm*.

SINCE it has therefore been proved from the *apoſtolic practice* and *directions*, that a *difference* was expected, in the account to be given of their faith by the *candidates for Baptiſm*, and the account to be given by the *candidates for the Miniſtry*; and ſince the ſame has been ſhewn to be a rational concluſion, in regard to all the primitive ages, even from the reaſon of the thing; the main point is ſecured; and all Mr. *Chandler*'s *talk* about *one* and the *ſame creed* uſed at *Baptiſm* and *Ordination*, comes not up to the point.—The *inquiry* was *more explicite* at *ordination*, and that's enough.—

BUT, to conclude this head, ſuppoſing that *even this* were not ſo; yet the *Church-Champion* is not yet ſo much *intimidated* by the *great Mr. Chandler*, as to be afraid of repeating, without aſking his leave, that the governors of every church are authorized from *Scripture* and *reaſon*, to *vary* the *particular methods*, and *forms of examination*, as the *variation* of *times* and *circumſtances* may require, as the *nature of the thing* demands, and *human prudence* may ſuggeſt; not only according to the *number of hereſies*, which is but one circumſtance; but alſo, as the *cunning craft of men* may render it, proportionably, more or leſs difficult to diſcover and fix their real ſentiments. —The art of *quibling* and *evaſion* may, like other *arts and ſciences*, increaſe with time; and though *hereſies* might be *more numerous* in the *firſt centuries*; yet the *art of evaſion*, the *cunning craft*, may be greater in the *laſt*: And ſince we have had ſome *refiners* among us, who were ready, not only *fraudulently to ſubſcribe* to the *Articles of the church*; but alſo, to *defend* ſuch *fraudulent ſubſcription upon principle*; This will juſtify the endeavouring to guard againſt ſuch prevarication, by ſuch methods as ſhall be thought the beſt calculated for it—And if men can evade the *preſent explanatory articles* of the church; this is not an argument againſt *all explanatory inquiry*; but is rather an argument for a *more explicite* one, ſo far at leaſt as the *fundamentals* and *eſſentials* of our Religion may be aſcertained. —Add to this, that when we find the *enjoyment* of *Church preferments and emoluments* to have ſuch an effect upon ſome mens minds, as to make them even endeavour to raiſe diſturbances, and to *incroach* both upon the *Religious* and *Civil Eſtabliſhment*, and demand them as the *natural rights* of Chriſtians, without *qualifying themſelves* according to the

the preſent *Laws of the Legiſlature*; Theſe ſurely are *times* and *circumſtances*, when it becomes the Eſtabliſhment to *look about her*; and to guard, by *explicite inquiries*, againſt the *ſecret underminings*, as well as againſt the *open attacks*, of her long and inveterate enemies: And if it ſhould be thought, that the *allurements* of theſe *preferments and emoluments* (of which they talk ſo *feelingly*) when they find they cannot be *admitted* into the offices of truſt to which they are annexed, by a diſpenſing with the explicite inquiry they exclaim againſt; may tempt ſome men to endeavour to *creep into them* by the *cunning craft*, and *prevarication* abovementioned; This would be no more an argument for *leſſening* any *ſecurities* we have, than it would be, to urge the *taking away all oaths to the Civil Government*, in order to *prevent perjury*—We are to take the *wiſeſt* and *moſt prudent* methods we are able, and to leave the reſt to *Providence*.

I AM now arrived at the laſt ſtage of my journey.

Hic labor extremus———

The laſt point, againſt which Mr. *Chandler* has exhibited his exceptions, is,

V.

MY *appeal* to the ſenſe, and practice of foreign *Proteſtant-Churches*.

IN order to judge of the force of Mr. *Chandler*'s *anſwer* to this; the reader muſt be informed, to *what uſe* and *end* I made this appeal. Now it was, becauſe "the Diſſenters have commonly "made *their appeals* to the *foreign reformed*

" *Churches*, againſt the *Church of England*: And " the acts, decrees, and canons of the national " councils of the reformed Church of *France*, " (which they allow to have been one of the beſt " of the reformed) were publiſhed in two volumes " fol. *Lond.* 1692. intitled, *Synodicon in Gallia* " *reformata*, by a *Diſſenting Miniſter* among the " *Preſbyterians*; and *recommended*, as containing " excellent expedients for preventing and healing " of *ſchiſms* in the Church, and for re-uniting the " diſmembered Body of divided Proteſtants; col- " lected out of the original manuſcript Acts of " thoſe Synods:" And yet, " ſubſcription is more " *ſparingly required*, and *more eaſy* to be *complied* " *with* in the *Church of England*, than in that " very *Church of France* — All, who were " admitted into the Miniſtry, were obliged to " *conformity* and *uniformity*, by *Subſcription* and " *Oaths* —— In ſome caſes, even *private per-* " *ſons* were *required to ſubſcribe*[m]" &c. — The reader may ſee the whole, fully and particularly, in Mr. *Bingham*'s work, intitled, " The *French* " *Church*'s Apology *for the Church* of *England*; a " work, chiefly extracted out of the authentic " Acts and Decrees of the *French* national Synods, " and the moſt approved Writers of that Church:" An Abſtract of which I have given, in *Church of England vindicated*, p. 49—53.

Now, was it not very proper, in regard to the *Diſſenters* (to whom I had here *expreſsly a view*) who exclaim ſo bitterly againſt the *Church of England* for the practice of *ſubſcription to explanatory articles*; to recall to their memory, that the *reformed Church of France*, that *very Church*, which *they have eſteemed the beſt of the reformed*, that *very Church* which *they have publicly exhibited and recommended*

[m] Church of *England* vindicated, p. 49, 50.

mended in *oppoſition* to the *Church of England*—was it not *proper* and *pertinent* to remind them, that *that very Church* uſed the *ſame practice* (with the addition of *oaths*) *more ſtrictly* and *with greater difficulty to be complied with*, than the *Church of England?*—This was the *end* and *purpoſe* for which *I made my appeal* to the *reformed Church of France*, to which *they themſelves had firſt appealed.*—And now the reader is informed of this, he will find that all Mr. *Chandler* has ſaid, in *anſwer* to this, is of no force or validity.

" If we allow (ſays he) that the reformed " Church of *France* is one of the beſt of the re- " formed, we do not thereby allow her conſtitu- " tion to be *perfect*, and *free from blame*; nor ſet " her up as a pattern of doctrine and diſcipline, to " be followed by us, or any other Churches, any " farther than as both are agreeable to the Chriſtian " Standard, *&c.* [n]"—What then?—I did not appeal to it to ſhew that they did; but to ſhew only, that *that Church*, which *they allowed* to be one of the *beſt of the reformed*, did practice the *very ſame methods* as the *Church of England*, with greater ſtrictneſs; and therefore, that the Church of *England* had that Church, which they ſo allowed, agreeing with her in the opinion of the *neceſſity* of ſuch practice—He ſays, that " they do not ſet " up the reformed Church of *France* as a pattern " of doctrine and diſcipline, to be followed by " other Churches, any farther than as both are " agreeable to the Chriſtian Standard."—But they have *ſet her up* as a *pattern in general*, and have *recommended* her in *oppoſition* to the *Church of England*; and if yet the Church of *England* appears to be *more moderate*, in *that very practice* againſt which they are ſo *clamorous*; is not this ſufficient to

[n] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 146.

to *ſtop their mouths* in *ſuch appeal*, when the *Church appealed to by them*, as one of the *beſt of the reformed*, in *oppoſition* to the *Church of England*, is found to *agree* with the *Church of England*, and to be *oppoſite* in their ſentiments and practice on this head to the *Diſſenters?*—Does it not ſufficiently ſhew the *unreaſonableneſs* and *perverſeneſs* of thoſe, who ſet up their own opinions againſt *all the reformed Churches*; and, in particular, againſt *that* which they themſelves have *owned* and *appealed to*, as one of the *beſt* of the reformed? But, it is not reformed in *every* inſtance according to their *own model—It's conſtitution* (it ſeems) *is not perfect*—that is, it is not quite to Mr. *Chandler*'s taſt; he, no doubt, would make it perfect at once, and our *Diſſenters* are the only men in the world, who are qualified for the grand work of *reforming the Reformation.*

So again—he ſays, "If upon compariſon it "ſhould be found, that the Church of *England* is "*leſs arbitrary and ſevere* than the Proteſtant "Church of *France*, this will not prove that the "ſeverities of ſubſcription ſhe ſtill maintains are "at all *juſtifiable*, or that the impoſing power ſhe "yet aſſumes and exerciſes is agreeable to the e-"vangelical conſtitution, and the *nature of Chri-"ſtianity**,"—No; nor was any ſuch thing intended to be proved by that compariſon.—That the Church of *England* practices nothing *unjuſtifiable*, in *requiring ſubſcription*, was proved by *other arguments*: The compariſon between her diſcipline, and That of the Proteſtant Church of *France*, in this inſtance, was produced only to ſhew, that the *beſt reformed* Churches, in the opinion of the *Diſſenters themſelves*, have declared *their judgment* of the *neceſſity* of the *practice of ſubſcription* to *explanatory articles*,

* Caſe of Subſcription, p. 147.

articles, of the *juſtifiableneſs* of the practice, and of its containing nothing *inconſiſtent* with the *nature of Chriſtianity*; and that their judgment is therefore, in this point, *directly contrary* to the judgment of the *Diſſenters*—This was what it was produced for; This it proves, and therefore proves as much as was intended in it.

"'Tis unworthy (he ſays) the character of "men of learning and candour to bring authority "inſtead of reaſon, example inſtead of proof, or "to urge cuſtom, when they ſhould firſt prove "the cuſtom fit and lawful [p]."—Here is the ſame *miſrepreſentation* again.—I do not bring the *authority* of foreign Proteſtant Churches *inſtead of reaſon*; their example *inſtead of proof*; nor *urge their cuſtom*, without having firſt produced my reaſons and arguments for the *fitneſs* and *lawfulneſs* of the *practice*, in general, of an explanatory inquiry. The practice is proved *fit* and *lawful* from other conſiderations; The merits of the cauſe were tried before; and the *Judgment* and *Practice* of foreign Proteſtant Churches, the practice in general of ſubſcription to explanatory inquiries, were properly urged againſt *thoſe*, who have *appealed to* their judgment of *Church-diſcipline in general*—properly urged, not to prove the *lawfulneſs* of ſuch diſcipline; *That* had been proved before from other *topics*; but, as a *fit* and *ſufficient reply* to *thoſe particular perſons*, by ſhewing, that the *judgment* which *they appeal to*, and *approve in general* concerning *Church-diſcipline*, ſtands *againſt them* in this particular of it; that thoſe reformers who, according to the *Diſſenters themſelves*, were the *moſt wiſe*, *prudent*, and *judicious*, and reformed in the *beſt manner*, and upon the *beſt plan*; yet *judged the very practice* which the *Diſſenters condemn* in

[p] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 154.

in the *Church of England*, to be a *wiſe*, *prudent*, and *neceſſary proviſion* to preſerve the purity of the Chriſtian faith; and therefore herein riſe up in judgment againſt the *Diſſenters*, and condemn them.

But, I had obſerved farther, that "ſober "and conſiderate men would not be for *lightly* "*throwing off*, what hath univerſally been thought, "and practiced as, an *uſeful* and *neceſſary* part of "Church-Government [q]." — Mr. *Chandler* anſwers, that "the cuſtoms and practices of the "whole *Popiſh Church* are againſt the Proteſtants. "What then? is Popery ever the better on "this account? Do not Proteſtants frankly con-"demn them [r]."—Yes; But they did not *lightly throw them off*, or upon *no better reaſons* and arguments than the *old Whig*, or Mr. *Chandler*, has produced againſt ſubſcription to explanatory articles, or againſt an explanatory inquiry in the caſe in quæſtion. The doctrines and practices of the whole Popiſh Church have had (as Mr. *Chandler* will allow) a long, fair, and ſtrict examination, by wiſe and learned men; and have been clearly and evidently proved, to the ſatisfaction and conviction of great part of the Chriſtian world, to be *impious*, *idolatrous*, *abſurd*, and *contemptible*, and to be *unſupported by reaſon or Scripture*; which are the reaſons Mr. *Chandler* himſelf gives, why Proteſtants condemn the doctrines and practices of the Popiſh Church [s]. Theſe doctrines and practices therefore, whatever univerſality they have had, are not *lightly thrown off* by Proteſtants—But is this the caſe in relation to an *explanatory inquiry* into the faith of the candidates of the Miniſtry? Has Mr. *Chandler*, or the *old Whig*, or any body elſe, as

[q] Church of *England* vindicated, p. 54.
[r] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 154. [s] Ibid.

as clearly and *evidently proved* this to be *impious, abſurd*, or *unſupported by reaſon or Scripture*; as Proteſtants have proved *tranſubſtantiation*, and *Image-worſhip*, and the reſt of the peculiar doctrines and practices of the Popiſh Church to be? Can Mr. *Chandler* find us out *any Churches*, or *any part* of the *Chriſtian world*, that have received the *like ſatisfaction* and *conviction* againſt the lawfulneſs of the practice in quæſtion? — except a *few Sectariſts* who diſſent from the *Church of England*; and perhaps a few private perſons, whoſe objections to an explanatory inquiry are not ſo much becauſe they think it *unlawful in itſelf*, as becauſe they have ſome reaſons againſt giving an account of their own faith, and are *againſt explanatory articles*, only becauſe *explanatory articles* are *againſt them*.— Does Mr. *Chandler* therefore put the caſe, of *himſelf and Brethren condemning ſubſcription to explanatory articles*, or an explanatory inquiry; upon an equality with the caſe, of the *Proteſtant-world condemning the Popiſh Churches?* — When Mr. *Chandler* has ſhewn his reaſons againſt an explanatory inquiry to be *as good*, and to be *allowed ſo* upon as *good authority*, as thoſe upon which the *Proteſtants* have rejected the doctrines and practices of the *Popiſh Church*; when he has ſhewn that *Proteſtants* have *lightly thrown off* the *latter*, and upon *no better reaſons* than what Mr. *Chandler* has advanced for throwing off the *former*; then, and not before, he will have a right of returning my cenſure —'Till he has done This, it muſt ſtick where it is.

AGAIN, he tells me that "the foreign Proteſtant Churches diſapprove Dioceſan Epiſcopacy, "and by conſequence the *Epiſcopal Government* "of the *Church of England*, as contrary to the "order and eſtabliſhment of Chriſt. Will the "gentleman (ſays he) paſs his cenſure on this

" ſubject too? and ſay, the Church of *England*, " that oppoſes *her ſingle judgment to the united* " *verdict of the whole Proteſtant world*, is an Opi- " niatre, and ſelf-conceited? I leave him here (ſays " he) to his private meditations.'"--No; But I will ſay, that I muſt look upon *thoſe* to be *Opiniatres*, and *ſelf-conceited*, who imagine the *arguments* which *they* have advanced *againſt an explanatory inquiry*, &c. to be as *good as thoſe* by which the Church of *England* hath *vindicated* her *Epiſcopal government*; and therefore, that the *cenſure* which I paſſed upon the *former*, of *oppoſing their ſingle judgment to the united verdict of the Proteſtant world*, might be very juſt, and due to the *reaſons* on which *their* judgment is founded; and yet will not affect the *latter*, 'till Mr. *Chandler* has ſhewn that *their* judgment is *no better* ſupported.— The one does not *lightly*, or without ſolid and ſubſtantial reaſons, retain her Epiſcopal government; The other *lightly rejects* the practice of an explanatory inquiry &c. upon *inconcluſive*, *weak*, and *trifling objections*, and without giving *ſufficient anſwers* to the arguments for the *neceſſity* of it.—The difference of the two caſes ſuppoſed is very evident; and therefore it is as evident, that a cenſure paſſed in the one caſe, cannot, 'till Mr. *Chandler* (*or ſome of his friends for him*) has ſhewn the two caſes to be equal, *equally* affect the other.

But ſuppoſe I ſhould diſpute the *fact* with him, that the Church of *England*, in her *Epiſcopal government*, oppoſes *her ſingle judgment to the united verdict of the Proteſtant world?*--Does not this gentleman know, that the *Lutherans* in *Denmark*, *Sweden*, &c. retained Epiſcopacy? And *Buddeus* ſhall ſpeak for thoſe in *Germany*, who vindicates them in this point,

[t] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 155.

point, againſt the charge of *Dodwel* and others [u], Are not theſe part of the *Proteſtant world?* And as to the *Calviniſts themſelves*, their *firſt Reformers* (Mr. *Chandler* ſhould have known) did not *diſapprove Epiſcopacy*, nor the *Epiſcopal government in the Church of England*; and oppoſed, not the *Epiſcopal* Hierarchy, but only the *Papal*. They looked upon it as an unjuſt reproach upon them to think they condemned Epiſcopacy: They declare that they did not throw it off, but could not have it there at *Geneva*, without coming under the *Papal Hierarchy*. In their ſeveral letters to Q. *Elizabeth*, to the Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and other *Engliſh Biſhops*, they *approved*, and *congratulated* the *Epiſcopal Government* of the *Church of England*, and regretted that they could not have the like; which they owned as a great defect in their Churches [x].—The words of *Beza* and *Calvin* are expreſs. The former ſays, "If there "be any perſons (which you will not eaſily per-"ſuade me) who reject the whole order of Epi-"ſcopacy, far be it from any man *in his ſenſes* to "aſſent to their madneſs [y]:" And particularly as to the *government of the Church of England*, ſo far

[u] Neque objici nobis poteſt, quod Epiſcopatus in eccleſia noſtra plane abrogatus ſit— non tantum enim *eam* poteſtatem, qua in eccleſia apoſtolica *Presbyteri* gaviſi ſunt, verbi divini miniſtris relinquimus; ſed quibuſdam etiam [ſcil. Presbyterorum] etiam ἐξοχὴν quædam ac inſpectio in reliquos tribuitur, qui Superintendentium, aut *Præpoſitorum*, aut Inſpectorum nomine veniunt; quamquam et alicubi *Epiſcopi* adpellitentur. *Iſagog. ad Theol.* Vol. I. p. 746.

[x] Vid. *Durel*'s View of the Government and Worſhip in the reformed Churches beyond the Seas. Printed 1662.

[y] Si qui ſunt autem (quod ſanè mihi non facilè perſuaſeris) qui omnem Epiſcoporum ordinem rejiciant, abſit ut quiſquam ſatis ſanæ mentis furoribus illorum aſſentiatur.—*Beza* ad Tractat. de Miniſt. Ev. Grad. ab Hadrian. Sarav. Belg. edit. c. 1.

far was he from *diſapproving* it, that he looked upon it as "a *ſingular bleſſing*, and wiſhed that "ſhe might *ever enjoy it*[z]." And *Calvin himſelf* declares, that, as to "ſuch an Hierarchy, "wherein *Biſhops* ſo *preſide*, as not refuſing to "be *ſubject to Chriſt*, and to depend upon him "as their only head; they are worthy to be "*anathematized* (if there be any ſuch) who will "not *reverence* it, and *ſubmit to it with all obedience*[a]"—From whence it is plain, that there were none in his time to be found, who oppoſed the *Epiſcopal Government*, but only the *Papal*; and that our *modern Diſſenters* would have been looked upon in this particular, by *Beza* as *madmen*, and by *Calvin* as perſons who deſerved to be *anathematized*. Where now is the *united verdict* of the *whole Proteſtant world* againſt the *Church of England* in this point? Theſe were the principles of the *firſt Reformers* of the foreign Proteſtant Churches. Even the *Calviniſts* ſet up Preſbyterian Government by *neceſſity*; and retained and declared their regard, at the ſame time, for the *Epiſcopal order* and *authority*, in diſtinction from That of *Presbyters*. And if others have departed from the principles of their firſt Reformers, the judgment of the Church of *England* is not to be looked upon as *ſingle* on that account; who is not obliged to *change her judgment*, which had thus the *ſuffrage* of the *firſt Reformers* abroad, and the *primitive principles of the reformation*; in compliance

[z] Fruatur ſanè iſtâ ſingulari Dei beneficentiâ, quæ utinam ſit illi perpetua. *Ibid.* c. 18.

[a] Talem ſi nobis Hierarchiam exhibeant, in quâ ſic emineant Epiſcopi, ut Chriſto ſubeſſe non recuſent, et ab illo tanquam unico capite pendeant, &c. Tum verò nullo non anathemate dignos fatear, ſi qui erunt, qui non eam revereantur, ſummâque obedientiâ obſervent—*Calvin.* de neceſſitat. Eccleſ. reformand.

ance with thoſe who ſhall *depart from them*, or with every *novel Sect* which ſhall riſe up.

But I muſt remind Mr. *Chandler* alſo, that no longer ſince than 1680, the then Biſhop of *London*, in order to reconcile the diſſenters by the *judgment* of the *foreign Divines*, having wrote to Monſieur *Le Moyne Profeſſor of Divinity* at *Leyden*, and to Monſieur *L'Angle*, one of the *Preachers* of the reformed Church of *Charington* near *Paris*, and to Monſieur *Claude* another eminent *French Divine*; They, in their ſeveral anſwers, agree in a *vindication* of the *Church of England* from any *Errors* in the *Doctrine*, or any *unlawful impoſitions* in the *Service* and *Diſcipline* of it; which anſwers you may ſee at the end of Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s *unreaſonableneſs of Separation*, 1681, 4to.—And ſurely, *Epiſcopacy* is one part, either of her *Doctrine* or *Diſcipline*, or *both*.

And now, what is become of the *ſingle judgment* of the *Church of England* againſt the *united verdict* of the *whole Proteſtant world*, in the point of *Church-Government*?—It appears on the contrary, that the *united verdict* of the *firſt Reformers* is with the *Church of England* in this point; and that the *judgment* of *foreign Proteſtants* was declared to be ſo likewiſe, when wrote to upon the ſubject; and conſequently, that our *modern Diſſenters* are *Diſſenters*, not only from the *Church of England*, but from *Calvin* as well as *Luther*, from *all Reformers* at home and abroad; and, in *this particular*, as well as in That of an *explanatory inquiry*, are the men who *oppoſe their ſingle judgment* to the *united verdict* of the *whole Proteſtant*, and *Chriſtian world*. — And therefore Mr. *Chandler* had better not have *dragged* a point into this controverſy, with which it has nothing to do; and which turns out ſo little to his advantage —*I leave him here to his private meditations*.

But,

But, he ſays, that "if the whole Proteſtant "world, and I will ſay (adds he) the whole "Chriſtian world, ſhould agree in impoſing "ſubſcriptions to explanatory articles of faith; "yet if that impoſition be wrong in its nature, "hath no foundation in Scripture, is not a pro-"per method of promoting unity and purity of "faith, and is abſolutely contrary to the genius, "ſpirit, and whole conſtitution of Chriſtianity; "the practice of the whole chriſtian world would "be no vindication of the thing, nor prove the "lawfulneſs and expediency of it; and *ſhould any* "*one* oppoſe *his ſingle judgment* to this *united* "*verdict and practice of the Chriſtian world*, he "would not deſerve the reproach of an Opinia-"tre, and ſelf-conceited perſon, but the charac-"ter of an *underſtanding*, *wiſe*, and conſiſtent "Chriſtian [b]."— But till Mr. *Chandler* has pro-ved that an explanatory inquiry *is* thus wrong in its nature, hath no foundation in Scripture, &c. which he has not yet done, nor (I ſhall venture to ſay, if we may judge from the ſpecimen he has given us) will ever be able to do; all he has here ſaid is to go for nothing.—In the mean while, I muſt have liberty to tell him, that whatever *private man* ſets himſelf up as a *man of wiſdom* and *underſtanding*, ſhould have very good evidence indeed, before he ventures to declare (For this is what Mr. *Chandler* here aſſerts *any one* may do, upon the credit of his *ſingle judgment*) that he thinks himſelf *wiſer* than the *whole Chriſtian world*. This, I ſuppoſe, is to go for another inſtance of Mr. *Chandler*'s boaſted *noble and virtuous pride*. But I muſt tell him, that true wiſdom and underſtanding are ſeldom found, where modeſty, and an humble opinion of our ſelves are wanting. It is

[b] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 152.

is the worſt ſort of wiſdom, to be *wiſe in our own conceit*; which often induces us to miſtake That for *wiſdom* and *underſtanding*, which is nothing but *opiniatrety* and *ſelf-ſufficiency*. A *wiſe man* will pay great regard to the opinions and judgment of men *as wiſe*, and under the ſame circumſtances and advantages as himſelf; much more to the opinion and judgment of the *whole Chriſtian world*: And though he will not think himſelf obliged to receive even ſuch univerſal opinions and practices *implicitly*, or *without examining* into the *grounds* and *foundations* upon which they ſtand; yet he will eſteem it to be the *beſt exerciſe*, and the *beſt evidence*, of his *wiſdom* and *underſtanding*, to examine the *more carefully*, *fairly*, and *diſpaſſionately*; and not to be for *lightly* and *ſuperciliouſly* rejecting what comes recommended to his examination with ſo *great an authority*, as That of the *whole Chriſtian word*. — Mr. *Chandler*'s fellow-labourer the *Old Whig* (another gentleman I ſuppoſe too of conſummate *wiſdom* and *underſtanding*) owned, that this particular practice of requiring ſubſcription to explanatory articles, was the practice of *all Churches whatever*; and the *Old Whig*'s fellow-labourer Mr. *Chandler*, joins with him in thinking, that, ſuppoſing it ſo, it would be never the better for that: Yet I muſt be of opinion, that the *concurrent* and *united judgment* of *all churches whatever* of the *whole Chriſtian world*, in a point of this nature particularly, a point of *Chriſtian prudence* in the exerciſe of *Church-diſcipline*, in confirmation and ſupport of the juſtneſs and validity of the reaſons and arguments produced for it; will always have *ſo much* weight with men of *true wiſdom* and *underſtanding*, that they will not be *obſtinately* and *pertinaciouſly*, and upon no better foundation than what the arguments produced againſt it have yet afforded, for abſolutely *throwing*

ing

ing off a practice of this kind; which, tho' ſome particular Churches may have exceeded in the methods and forms of exerciſing it, hath yet been *univerſally* by *all Churches whatever* of the *whole Chriſtian world*, judged to have been, in the general, in ſome times and circumſtances, a lawful and neceſſary practice in church diſcipline.——I argue not, that a number of Churches, or all Churches, agreeing in a practice of this nature, is an argument *in itſelf* of the *lawfulneſs* of it—The merits of the cauſe muſt, in the laſt reſult, be tried by the force of the reaſons and foundations on which it is built: But, *all churches* of the *chriſtian world agreeing* in it will be of *ſo much weight*; that *wiſe* and *underſtanding* men will not be for *lightly* contemning, and *throwing it off*, without a *more ſtrict* and *impartial examination*; or upon the credit only of *ſuch objections* and *cavils* as have appeared in the courſe of this debate.—This is all that I have affirmed, and which I ſhall continue to affirm, 'till I ſee ſuch objections *better ſupported* than I have yet done; without being afraid of the *wiſe* and *underſtanding* Mr. *Chandler*, or, his fellow-labourer, the *wiſe* and *underſtanding Old Whig*.—

But now we are arrived at the famous "ſpeech "of the *Reverend and learned John Alphonſo Turretine*, made to the leſſer Council of *Geneva*, "previous to the aboliſhing their ſubſcriptions "there." Mr. *Chandler* brags mightily of this ſpeech, which he has "tranſlated from a *French* "MS. containing ſome curious facts not ſo well, "or generally known amongſt us, and which "too (like his collection of creeds) hath never "been before publiſhed [c]."

The

[c] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 155.

THE deſign of publiſhing this ſpeech is to ſhew, that my "aſſertion is not true, *viz.* that the "*united verdict* of the *Proteſtant world* is in *favour of Subſcriptions*;" and that "the moſt *certain* "*facts* contradict it[d]."—Now, ſince Mr. *Chandler* triumphs ſo much in this ſpeech; I ſhall beg leave to lay before the reader the *following remarks* upon the ſpeech itſelf, with an examination of Mr. *Chandler*'s reaſoning and obſervations upon it; and ſhall then leave the reader to judge, when theſe *curious facts*, *not ſo well* or *generally known* amongſt us, are known and opened *fairly* and *truly*; whether This, like the reſt of Mr. *Chandler*'s *proofs* and *authorities*, does not *fail him upon the tryal*; whether the *Verdict* of the *Proteſtant world* may not be *in favour of Subſcriptions*, notwithſtanding any thing that appears in, or can be concluded from *this ſpeech* to the contrary; and whether therefore, Mr. *Chandler* might not as well have ſuppreſſed theſe *curious facts not ſo generally known*, and have permitted them to have remained quietly locked up in the *French* MS.

1. THE ſubſcription aboliſhed at *Geneva*, to which this Speech of Mr. *Turretine* was previous, was ſubſcription to the *Formula Conſenſus*: And it appears, that the great and chief reaſons (the others ſhall be taken notice of, when we come to Mr. *Chandler*'s reaſoning upon this ſpeech) here alledged by Mr. *Turretine* for aboliſhing this ſubſcription, were

Firſt, on account of the *form* of that ſubſcription, which runs thus: *Sic docebo, ſcilicet quoties hanc materiam tractare ſuſcipiam*; *I will thus teach, as often as I ſhall undertake to treat of this ſubject*: *Contrarium non docebo, neque ore, neque calamo, neque publice, neque privatim*; *I will not teach the*

 contrary,

[d] Caſe of Subſcript. p. 155.

contrary, neither by ſpeaking, nor writing, neither publicly, nor privately. The former part of which *form* of ſubſcription was looked upon, and indeed very juſtly, to be "*extremely equivocal*", and inconſiſtent with frankneſs and ſincerity; or which, in one word, might be a *fraudulent ſubſcription*: And the latter part of which, was as juſtly thought to "eſtabliſh a kind of very odious inquiſition; "eſpecially in converſations, and correſpondences "by letters; not at all agreeable to the nature of "ſubjects which all the world owns to be in-"different[e]." So that this was not aboliſhing ſubſcription as wrong *in itſelf*, but this *particular form* of ſubſcription as *eſtabliſhing* a kind of very *odious inquiſition*; and on account of it's being *equivocal* and *fraudulent*.—For, "it is not an indiffe-"rent thing (ſays Mr. *Turretine*) to have *equi-"vocating* ſubſcriptions[f]."

Secondly, other reaſons given for aboliſhing this ſubſcription are—that, "the matters to which this "ſubſcription was required, were ſuch as Perſons "of *all ſides avow* to be *indifferent*, and *no ways "eſſential to ſalvation*"—that, "in the judgment "of one party as well as another, they are *not of "neceſſity* and *importance*"—that, they are "things "*purely indifferent*"— that, they are "ſubjects "which *all the world avow* to be *indifferent*"—— that, the matters in quæſtion have "*little impor-"tance*"—"very *obſcure* and *exceeding difficult*"— "many of them ſuch, as are *abſolutely impoſſible "to be decided*"—that, it was "the conſtant, gene-"ral ſenſe of their churches, that theſe matters "are *by no means eſſential* to ſalvation"—that, "all theſe matters were treated by the moſt rigid "of

[e] *Vid.* Mr. *Turretine's* Speech; in Caſe of Subſcript. p. 158, 159, 160.

[f] Ibid. p. 174.

" of their Divines as *an affair of nothing*"—that, " all the members of their ſociety, even thoſe " who are the warmeſt, have avowed that theſe " things are *entirely indifferent*, and *no ways eſſen-* " *tial* to ſalvation" — and, that " it was on this " foundation they conſented to cut off the words " *ſic ſentio*"—that, " they have *no kind of influ-* " *ence* whatſoever, either upon *morals*, or on the " *worſhip of God*, or on the *method of preaching*". —that, " it would be of *little edification*, I might " even ſay (adds Mr. *Turretine*) in ſome meaſure " *ſcandalous, to ſpeak to the people about them*" — that, " they are matters *not controverted* amongſt " their Teachers"—that, they are " *Bagatelles*, " or *trifling things*[s]."

See here the motives, and reaſons for aboliſhing ſubſcription at *Geneva!* It evidently appears, from one end of Mr. *Turretine*'s *Speech* to the other, that it was *not* on account of any conviction or perſuaſion of the *unlawfulneſs* of ſubſcription to *explanatory articles* in *itſelf*, or in the *general:* There is not *one word* in Mr. *Turretine*'s *Speech* that either *expreſſes*, or *implies* it: But it was aboliſhing *that ſubſcription* to the *formula conſenſus*, that *particular ſubſcription*, as ſuch. The reaſons given for it are what *no way affect* ſubſcription to explanatory articles in the *general*; but ſuch as relate *particularly* and *only to that* ſubſcription; reaſons, drawn from the *particular form* of *that* ſubſcription, and from *the particular matters* there required to be ſubſcribed.— Can Mr. *Chandler* deny this? If he can, he muſt produce his *French* MS, and prove his *own tranſlation* to be *ſpurious*.—It lies before the world, and the appeal is to them.—If he cannot deny this; why does

[s] *Vid.* Mr. *Turretine*'s Speech; in Caſe of Subſcript. p. 160, 161, 163, 164, 168, 175.

does he pretend to paſs upon us this *Geneva-Speech*, as of any force or authority, for proving the *judgment* of *foreign Proteſtant Churches* to be againſt the *lawfulneſs* of ſubſcription in *general?*

2. THOUGH, upon the 'foremention'd reaſons, ſubſcription to the *Formula Conſenſus* was aboliſhed; yet, they did not think, as Mr. *Chandler* does, that there ought to be *no teſt of orthodoxy*, no *abridgment* of the *liberty of Teachers*, no *explanatory inquiry* or articles, no *uniformity* in *Doctrines*. No; there was ſtill a teſt and regulation of this kind to be obſerved. Mr. *Turretine* declares, that the deſign was "to meddle nothing with *doctrinal* "*matters*, nor with their *regulations*." They were to "*remain in their full force:*" And that the attempt was only "to ſoften the *extravagant* "and *exceſſive rigour* which attended theſe ſub-"ſcriptions." It was propoſed, that all *Public Teachers* ſhould be ſtill obliged to conform, in their ſermons and lectures, in the *Church* and the *Academy*, to their *regulations*, and the doctrine of this very *Formula Conſenſus*; which, though *ſubſcription* to it was aboliſhed, was yet "to be the "*only doctrine taught*, and they who were of *con-*"*trary ſentiments* were *not to be allowed to teach* "*them*[h]:" And Mr. *Chandler* acquaints us, that one of the "qualifications thenceforward re-"quired of all who offered themſelves to the Mi-"niſtry," was, "to *promiſe*, that they will teach "nothing in the *Church* nor *Academy*, that is "contrary to the *Conſenſus Helveticus*, or the "Confeſſion of the *Gallican Church*[i]."——Mr. *Chandler* may pleaſe to conſider, whether *this injunction*, which lays an obligation upon Public Teachers, *not to teach* doctrines *contrary* to thoſe con-

[h] *Vid.* Mr. *Turretine's* Speech; in Caſe of Subſcript. p. 162, 163, 169. [i] Ibid. 176.

contained in a *Conſenſus* or articles, *ready drawn up to their hands by others, and of which they had no ſhare in the making*; be not an *impoſition*, and a *reſtraint* upon *Chriſtian Liberty*, ſo far as it goes, equally with requiring a *profeſſion of belief*.—Mr. *Turretine* ſays, that it is "*contrary to ſincerity* to "engage one's ſelf *to teach* that which one *doth* "*not* believe, if at the ſame time in contrary ſen-"timents[k]."— I ſhould be glad to be informed, whether it be not alſo *contrary to ſincerity*, for a Public Teacher in the Chriſtian Church, to engage himſelf *not to teach* what he *doth* believe to be Scripture-doctrine.— If you ſay, that unleſs he believes the determinations of the *Conſenſus* to be true Scripture-doctrine, he ought not to engage himſelf *not to teach the contrary*; I anſwer, that, if he *does believe* theſe determinations to be *Scripture-doctrine*; there would be no more hardſhip in requiring him to *profeſs his belief* of them, than requiring him *to promiſe not to teach* the *contrary* doctrines: If he does *not* believe them to be *Scripture doctrine*; then, he is either obliged *to promiſe not to teach* what he believes to be *true Scripture-doctrine*, or to be *excluded from the Miniſtry*, and all the *preferments* and *emoluments* of the Church. Is not this a *reſtraint*, an *abridgment* of *Chriſtian Liberty?*—Is not every Public Teacher obliged, as ſuch, to make *the word of God* the *only authentic, authoritative judge* and *rule*, what he ought or ought not to teach; and not to ſubmit to any *human deciſions* in this caſe?—When Mr. *Chandler* recollects this, I ſhould think that the *excellent ſpeech* of Mr. *John Alphonſo Turretine* would not appear to be ſo much to Mr. *Chandler*'s taſt, as he could wiſh it; and that it might have been more

[k] *Vid.* Mr. *Turretine*'s Speech; in Caſe of Subſcript. p. 159.

more for the intereſt of his cauſe to have *ſuppreſſed*, than to have *tranſlated* it.

3. I MUST recommend it to Mr. *Chandler*'s obſervation, that Mr. *Turretine* expreſsly *allows*, that, in ſome times and circumſtances, *ſubſcription to explanatory articles* may be required *upon good reaſons*.

HE ſays—"We are fully perſuaded, that theſe "eſtabliſhments were made with good views, and "that they might then have *good reaſons* for "them [l]."—And that the aboliſhing them at any time, may be conſiſtent, in the ſame perſons, with injoining them before: For he adds, "If thoſe "pious perſons, who had an hand in them, had "lived now, and had ſeen the ſtate of affairs in "*Germany*, *England*, &c. we are abundantly "convinced that they would have entered into "our ſentiments [m]." — All this ſhews that Mr. *Turretine* was of opinion; not with Mr. *Chandler*, that *no times or circumſtances* can *ever* make *ſubſcription to explanatory articles neceſſary*; no, he was not ſo dogmatical and poſitive; But, that *ſome times* and *circumſtances* may render the *requiring ſuch ſubſcription*, *reaſonable*; which *other* times and circumſtances may render improper or unneceſſary: And therefore he allows, what gives Mr. *Chandler* ſo much offence in my Book, *viz.* that "the "*particular rules*, and methods of inquiry, and "the teſts proper to be required of the qualifica-"tions of Candidates for the Miniſtry, muſt "*change and vary* according to the *variations of* "*times and circumſtances*, and muſt be left to the "*diſcretion* of thoſe who are to *exerciſe* ſuch au-"thority."— How indeed it is *conſiſtent*, to declare (as Mr. *Turretine* does) that the doctrines, ſubſcrip-

[l] *Vid.* Mr. *Turretine*'s Speech; in Caſe of Subſcript. p. 173.
[m] Ibid.

ſubſcription to which they aboliſhed, were not only *Bagatelles*, things *indifferent*, and of no importance, but even ſuch as it would be *ſcandalous to ſpeak to the people about*; and yet, that times and circumſtances might be ſuch, as to make the requiring ſubſcription to *ſuch matters* founded upon *good reaſons* — nay, to admit that *even ſtill* this ſhould be the *only doctrine taught*, and that they who were of *contrary ſentiments* ſhould *not be allowed to teach them* — for this, it is none of my buſineſs to account—I leave it to Mr. *Chandler*, when he ſhall think proper to give us an Edition of the *French Manuſcript*, with his *critical* notes upon it.

4. Mr. *Chandler*, having finiſhed the tranſlation of his *French Manuſcript*, breaks forth in the heigth of his joy and triumph, into an expoſtulation.—"What now is become of the united ver-"dict of the Proteſtant world [a]?" What? Why, for ought I ſee, it is juſt where it was before. Subſcription to explanatory articles he owns they had: But (ſays he) they *dropped* and *diſuſed* them [b]. Why? not a word appears againſt the *lawfulneſs* of the *practice in the general*, or *in itſelf*; But, at *Geneva*, the *form* uſed in ſubſcription to the *Formula Conſenſus* was *equivocal*, inconſiſtent with *ſincerity*; and the *matters* contained in it were *trifling*, and of *no importance*, &c. Therefore they aboliſhed, not ſubſcription *as ſuch*, or as *unlawful in itſelf*; but, *this particular* ſubſcription, for the reaſons above given; not that ſubſcription *as ſubſcription*, but, as ſubſcription to the *Formula Conſenſus*: And at the ſame time a *verbal promiſe* is required, *not to teach* any doctrine *contrary* to it; a method which is, as I before obſerved, an abridgment of Chriſtian liberty as much as the other.—

I may

[a] Caſe of Subſcript. p. 176.
[b] Ibid. 176, 177.

I may here add, that a *verbal promiſe, not to teach* the contrary doctrines, being equal in its force and obligation, with every *honeſt* man, to *ſubſcribing* ſuch promiſe; This method, of taking a *verbal promiſe*, inſtead of *ſubſcription to it*, while it laid a reſtraint upon the Chriſtian liberty of all ſuch, and excluded them from all the preferments and emoluments of the Church, equally as if they ſubſcribed it; left room for fraud and prevarication to all thoſe who were diſpoſed to take advantage of it; when they knew that they could not be convicted upon record.

As to the other places he mentions, *viz. Baſil, Zurich, Newchatel*, and *St. Gall*; no particular account is here given of the motives they proceded upon, any way affecting ſubſcription as ſuch, and therefore nothing can be ſaid to them— Only I may juſt hint, that after Mr. *Chandler* has mentioned all theſe Proteſtant ſtates, as having "*once* "*had their ſubſcriptions*;" he tells us, that "they experienced the inconveniences of them; "and they were *dropped, diſuſed*, and by public "authority removed out of ſeveral Proteſtant "States and Churches, where they have never "been ſuffered to return to this very day [p]."—— Where? Would not any one imagine it was in *all theſe* Proteſtant States and Churches which he had juſt before mentioned, *viz.* at *Baſil, Zurich, Newchatel*, and *St. Gall?* Yet this is not true; For, at *St. Gall*, ſubſcription was *not* abſolutely removed, as appears from this very Speech; For Mr. *Turretine* tells us (though Mr. *Chandler* would not) that, at *St. Gall*, they are *ſtill obliged* to ſubſcribe, "when admitted into the ſynod of the "Churches of *Appenzel* and *St. Gall* [q]." But Mr. *Chandler*,

[p] Caſe of Subſcript. p. 176, 177.
[q] Ibid. p. 167.

Chandler, though he has mentioned *all theſe* ſtates together; and tells us, that "*they once had their* "*ſubſcriptions*; that *they experienced the inconve-* "*niences of them*;" and, one would imagine, was going to tell us, that they were *removed out of them all*; he ſays indeed only, that they were "re- "moved out of *ſeveral* Proteſtant States and "Churches;" which does not neceſſarily include *St. Gall:* But why then, when he was giving us a detail of ſeveral Proteſtant States and Churches, out of which ſubſcriptions *were* removed; did he name *St. Gall*, out of which they were *not* removed?—This may have been a ſlip of his pen, and excuſable from his *great zeal* againſt *ſubſcription*, which he was willing to *remove* out of *as many Churches as he could*—pity! the miſtake happened to be on that ſide which moſt ſerved his purpoſe! For Mr. *Chandler*, to be ſure, was "not conſcious to himſelf of any intention, to *de-* "*ceive* any perſon living."—

He ſays, "the very Church of *England* ex- "preſſed her diſlike of them, and her Biſhops re- "monſtrated againſt them[r]."—Againſt what? againſt ſubſcription *as ſuch*, as *unlawful* in the *nature of the thing?* No ſuch matter; yet this is what he would inſinuate. What they expreſſed their diſlike of, was the *Geneva-ſubſcription* to the *Formula Conſenſus*, for reaſons *peculiar* to *that particular* ſubſcription. This appears to have been the caſe, from this ſpeech of Mr. *Turretine*—"Our "ſociety" (ſays he) "thinks in general, that "there are great inconveniences in leaving any "kind of ſubſcriptions whatſoever *to ſuch matters* "*as theſe*, which *perſons of all ſides* avow to be "*indifferent*, and *no ways eſſential to ſalvation*— "Theſe ſubſcriptions are alſo extremely offenſive

[r] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 176.

" to other churches, which are not of the ſame " ſentiments; particularly thoſe of *Germany* and " *England*, who are continually complaining of " it[s]."—Of what? why, you ſee, not of ſubſcription in *general*, but of *that* ſubſcription to the *Formula Conſenſus*, as ſuch; ſubſcription to matters *avowed, by perſons on all ſides, to be indifferent*; to matters *no way eſſential to ſalvation*; and wherein the Church of *England* was not of the *ſame ſentiments*.

AGAIN—" The Churches of *England* (ſays " Mr. *Turretine*) which hold ſo conſiderable a " rank in the Proteſtant intereſt, are extremely " diſpleaſed with *our* ſubſcriptions"—why?—The next words ſhew you—" For *they* are in *dif-* " *ferent ſentiments*, and they think that we con- " demn them by *our rigours*[t]."—*Rigorous* impoſition of ſubſcription, to matters *indifferent*, of *no importance*, and *no ways eſſential to Salvation*—This was what diſpleaſed the Church of *England*; This was what " the Biſhops of that country ſpoke " of." This was what Mr. *Turretine* complains of, as having " done them infinite harm, not " only among the Epiſcopal Party, but the " learned Preſbyterians[u]"—Not ſubſcription *in itſelf*, or *in general*; nothing of that appears, nor can Mr. *Chandler* prove it ſo to have been, though it was for his purpoſe ſo to repreſent it.—

BUT we have more of the ſame kind—" The " arguments (ſays Mr. *Chandler*) in this ſpeech " againſt the impoſition of ſubſcription to human " explanatory articles of faith, are ſo convincing " and ſtrong, *&c.*[x]"—Not one argument, in the whole ſpeech, againſt ſubſcription *as ſuch*, or againſt

[s] *Vid.* Mr. *Turretine*'s Speech; in Caſe of Subſcript. p. 160, 161. [t] Ibid. p. 165, 166. [u] Ibid. p. 166.
[x] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 176.

gainſt ſubſcription to explanatory articles *in general*; but againſt *this particular* ſubſcription only, founded upon *reaſons peculiar* to *that* ſubſcription—Not one word, from one end of this ſpeech to the other, againſt ſubſcription to explanatory articles of *faith*; but only againſt ſubſcription to points which are *no* articles of *faith*, but matters *purely indifferent*, of *no importance*, and *no ways eſſential to Salvation.*

AGAIN—Mr. *Chandler* tells us, that Mr. *Turretine* "had all the ſucceſs he deſired, all ſub-"ſcriptions to human formularies were aboliſhed "by public authority[y]."—What! *as ſuch?* and as unlawful *in general?* All ſubſcription to all human formularies? No; but ſubſcription *only* to a *particular* human formulary, for, and expreſsly on account of, it's containing *matters indifferent*, of *no importance*, *Bagatelles*, *&c.*—By obtaining the abolition of This only, Mr. *Turretine* had indeed *all the ſucceſs he deſired* from making this ſpeech—What *ſucceſs* Mr. *Chandler* will have from *tranſlating* it, the reader, I believe, by this time, can pretty well tell.

BUT we have more of it ſtill—"The reformed "Princes of *Germany* (ſays Mr. *Chandler*) and "particularly the King of *Pruſſia*, extremely "diſapproved them[z]"—diſapproved what?—Look into the ſpeech and you will ſee—"The "reformed Princes of *Germany*, who have *Lu-"therans* in their dominions, and eſpecially the "King of *Pruſſia*, extremely diſapprove *our ri-"gour.*"—Mr. *Turretine* adds—"The late Elect-"or of *Brandenbourg* wrote to the Proteſtant Can-"tons, deſiring them to uſe"—what? no Subſcriptions? No; but only "*more moderation* in "theſe affairs; giving them to underſtand, that "their *rigour* was extremely prejudicial to the de-

 "ſign

[y] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 176. [z] Ibid. p. 177.

" ſign he had formed of reuniting the *Lutbe-*
" *rans* [a]."—The *rigour*, in impoſing ſubſcription to matters of *no importance*, and yet about which the ſeveral Churches differed; This was what the *reformed Princes of Germany*, and the King of *Pruſſia* in particular, *extremely diſapproved*—But is this diſapproving *ſubſcription at large*, as Mr. *Chandler* repreſents it?—

AGAIN—" Upon examination they were
" found obſtructions to peace and unity, ſnares
" to conſcience, the ſources of inſincerity and e-
" quivocations [b]."—*what* were found to be ſo? Subſcriptions *in general?* No; but *ſuch* ſubſcription as *That* to the *Formula Conſenſus*; Subſcription in an *equivocal form*; Subſcription *rigorouſly impoſed* to *matters indifferent*, and of *no importance*; and engaging the ſubſcribers not to teach contrary doctrines, neither by *word* nor *writing*, neither *publicly* nor *privately*. " Theſe ſort of promiſes
" (ſays Mr. *Turretine*) are abſolutely impractica-
" ble, and no one knows how to keep them.
" For in truth 'tis not poſſible to be ſo exactly
" on one's guard, not only in public, but in
" private alſo, as in ſo many little quæſtions
" that are of no importance, to prevent every
" ſingle ſmall word from eſcaping one in refe-
" rence to them. So that this is really laying a
" *ſnare for the conſciences of men.*—They will be
" always a ſnare to entrap conſcience, and abſo-
" lutely impoſſible ever to be obſerved [c]."

Theſe were the reaſons upon which, not *ſubſcription in general*, which theſe reaſons *do not affect*, but this *Geneva-ſubſcription* was found to be a *ſnare to entrap conſcience*, and the *ſource of inſincerity and equivocations*—And we find other people too

[a] Mr. *Turretine*'s Speech; in Caſe of Subſcription, p. 166.
[b] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 177.
[c] Mr. *Turretine*'s Speech; in Caſe of Subſcript. p. 160, 161.

too can ſet *ſnares* and *traps*, in their own way—One would have thought, that a perſon who juſt came from *tranſlating* Mr. *Turretine*'s cenſure of *equivocal* and *fraudulent ſubſcription*, ſhould have avoided the like doings of all kinds; and, among the reſt, That of equivocal and *fraudulent repreſentations*.

And now Mr. *Chandler*, having thus diſplayed his cunning, procedes to diſplay his eloquence in a fine *apoſtrophe* to the foreign Divines. —*Generous Clergy!—worthy and virtuous Clergy!* —*Happy Clergy!* &c.—To all which I have nothing to ſay, and ſhall content myſelf with only *admiring*.

But he comes out of his *reverie*, and now we have him at *reaſoning* again.—"The Prelates of "the Church of *England* were inſtrumental in the "abrogating the ſubſcriptions at *Geneva*, who de- "clared themſelves grievouſly offended with them, "becauſe they apprehended that they condemned "their own ſentiments. But do not the ſubſcrip- "tions of the *Engliſh Church* carry in them an "*equal condemnation* of all other Churches and "perſons that differ from them? And will not "this be an *equal reaſon* for removing, or ſoften- "ing theſe ſubſcriptions here, as it was for thoſe "of *Geneva* entirely to ſuppreſs them there[d]?"

As to ſoftening, or ſuppreſſing our ſubſcriptions, I ſay nothing now: But, that the condemnation, which our ſubſcriptions are ſuppoſed to carry in them, of other Churches which differ from us, is an *equal reaſon* for us to remove them, as it was for thoſe of *Geneva* to remove the ſubſcription to the *Formula Conſenſus*; I muſt have leave to deny. For the *Formula Conſenſus* not merely *condemned the ſentiments* of other Churches which differed from it; But, it condemned their ſentiments

[d] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 178.

ſentiments (and was on that account too *rigorous*) in matters *avowed on all ſides* to be *indifferent*, *non-eſſentials*, and *impoſſible to be determined*, &c. Matters, therefore, not of a *nature* or *importance* ſufficient to *juſtify ſuch rigour*, and ſuch *condemnation of other Churches*.—This it was, which diſpleaſed the *Prelates of the Church of England*: This it was they *complained of*, and which induced them to be (as Mr. *Chandler* tells us) *inſtrumental in abrogating the Subſcription at Geneva*.—But Mr. *Chandler* had heard of an *Argumentum ad Hominem*, and *Parallels*, and was reſolved to make uſe of them whenever he thought they came in his way.—The misfortune is, that his *equal reaſon* is lame, and wants a leg: For, before he can prove what he offers, to be an *equal reaſon*; he muſt ſhew, that the matters in our Creeds and Articles, to which ſubſcription is required, are, like the matters in the *Formula Conſenſus*, *equally non-eſſentials*, *impoſſible to be determined*, and ſuch as are *avowed on all ſides to be indifferent*, &c.—This it is to ſet up for a reaſoner, without a proper ſtock.

ONCE more—"Can the Governors of the "*Engliſh* Church complain with juſtice of the ri-"gours of a practice in other Proteſtant Churches, "which they maintain themſelves in their own [a]?" *i. e.* The Governors of the *Engliſh Church* cannot complain with juſtice of the *rigours* of *other* Proteſtant Churches in requiring ſubſcription to *matters impoſſible to be determined*, *non-eſſentials*, and *avowed on all ſides to be indifferent*, and which it would be *even ſcandalous to ſpeak to the people about*—*Becauſe* the *Engliſh* Church requires ſubſcription to matters of a *quite different nature*, and therefore is *not guilty* of the *rigour* of which ſhe *complained* in *other* Proteſtant Churches.—This is rare logic! to which

[a] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 178.

which I really don't know what to ſay, but that it puts me in mind of the *expeditious reaſoners* in the Dunciad——

And Demonſtration thin, and Theſes thick,
And Major, Minor, and Concluſion quick.

UPON the whole, this Speech of Mr. *Turretine*, which Mr. *Chandler* has made ſo much noiſe with, turns out to be of no ſervice to him; and it appears, either that he did not at all underſtand the affair in the Speech he has *tranſlated*, or that he has, in his obſervations upon it, choſen to miſrepreſent it.—The reader ſees the whole of the matter to have been, that, at *Geneva* they aboliſhed ſubſcription to the *Formula Conſenſus*, not (as Mr. *Chandler* would repreſent it) becauſe they diſapproved, or condemned the practice of requiring ſubſcription to *explanatory Articles* as *unlawful* or iniquitous *in the general*, in *itſelf*, or *as ſuch*; but, becauſe the *form there uſed* was *equivocal*, was a *ſnare to conſcience*; and the *matters* required to be ſubſcribed were *non-eſſentials*, *impoſſible to be determined*, *avowed on all ſides to be indifferent*, *Bagatelles*, and about which it would be *even ſcandalous to ſpeak to the people*—All which reaſons affect *only* and merely *that particular ſubſcription*; and conclude nothing concerning their opinion of explanatory articles, or of requiring ſubſcription to them, *in the general*; or to ſuch, againſt which *no ſuch objections* lie, as Mr. *Turretine* has advanced againſt the *Formula Conſenſus*—Of this nothing appears throughout the whole ſpeech.

IF it ſhould be aſked, why, if they did not diſapprove of ſubſcription to explanatory articles *in itſelf*, did they not continue to injoin ſubſcription, only changing the matters?—The anſwer is obvious.—As the objections were to the *form* of the

the ſubſcription, and to the *doctrines* of the *Formula Conſenſus*; if they had propoſed to injoin ſubſcription ſtill, it muſt have been to *other* doctrines: But This, they eaſily foreſaw, would not have gone down, or met with ſucceſs. The ſcheme would then have appeared plainly to have been, not ſo much to have aboliſhed the *ſubſcription*, as the *doctrines*, and to have ſubſtituted others in the room of them. It was enough to get over the oppoſition to the aboliſhing the ſubſcription to the *Formula Conſenſus*. It was eaſier therefore, and the ſmoother way, to drop, and not to inſiſt on *any ſubſcription at all*. Whereas, if they had only propoſed to lay aſide *one* ſubſcription, and to eſtabliſh *another*; it would have met with greater oppoſition, and probably they would have failed in the ſucceſs of their main ſcheme.—The reaſon why they pleaded only for aboliſhing the *preſent ſubſcription* to the *Formula Conſenſus*, without propoſing ſubſcription to any *other Formula*; might be the ſame as perhaps it is, why Mr. *Chandler* and his Brethren plead only for aboliſhing ſubſcription to the explanatory articles of the *Church of England*, without inſiſting on another to the *Aſſembly's Catechiſm*, or articles of their own drawing up: And yet perhaps, if they could think ſuch a thing would go down, they might not diſapprove of ſuch ſubſcription. But as they know, I ſuppoſe, that this would be a vain attempt; the plea is only to aboliſh the *preſent ſubſcription*—It will be time enough to propoſe *another*, when they have, by degrees, filled up the *preferments* and *emoluments* of the Church, and have the power in their hands: For, if That were the caſe; I am not quite ſure, that the diſpute between us would not be the ſame, as Mr. *Chandler* repreſents That of the Popiſh and Proteſtant

[f] Caſe of Subſcription, p. 151.

Proteſtant Clergy in *France* to have been; "not "whether the impoſing power was right, but "which of them ſhould exerciſe it[f]."

If it be farther aſked—why, if their objections were only to the *doctrines*, did they ſuffer them to be ſtill the *only doctrines taught*, and yet *abolish ſubſcription* to them—Since This may ſeem to ſhew that their objections were rather to *ſubſcription as ſuch*, than to the *doctrines?*—I anſwer, that ſince Mr. *Turretine*, in the name of his party, declares that "no ill conſequences could be drawn from "theſe doctrines[g];" This might be a reaſon to induce them to permit ſuch doctrines to be the only doctrines taught at preſent, upon condition that *ſubſcription* to them might be aboliſhed; rather than, by endeavouring at *too much at once*, the whole ſhould be fruſtrated. Whether indeed it be conſiſtent to ſay, that *no ill conſequences can be drawn* from *ſuch doctrines* as it would be *even ſcandalous to ſpeak to the people about*; I am no more accountable, than how it was *conſiſtent* to ſuffer them to be the *only doctrines taught*, as I obſerved before.—Mr. *Turretine* ſays, it was to preſerve a "uniformity in the "manner of preaching[h]"—*i. e.* to preſerve an *uniformity* in preaching *non-eſſentials*, matters *indifferent*, of *no importance*, *Bagatelles*, and ſuch as it would be *even ſcandalous to ſpeak to the people* about. To preſerve *ſuch an uniformity of preaching*, one would think not to be an end very conſiſtent with the Character of thoſe *Generous Clergy!* thoſe *worthy and virtuous Clergy!* thoſe *happy Clergy!* which have received Mr. *Chandler*'s congratulations—I leave theſe things to be accounted for, by the admirers of this *excellent ſpeech of Mr. John Alphonſo Turretine.*

[f] Mr. *Turretine*'s Speech; in Caſe of Subſcription, p. 171.
[g] Ibid. p. 162.

AND ſo much for Mr. *Chandler* and his *French Manuſcript*; of which, if ever he ſhould (once in ten years) think proper to write again upon this ſubject; I would adviſe him to avoid giving the moſt diſtant hint, that may recall it to the reader's mind—For he has had ſuch ill luck the firſt time he ſet out with it, that it would not be adviſable for him to venture abroad with it again.

AND now, upon an impartial review of this ſubject, my ſentiments are ſincerely theſe.

I AM fully convinced, that the ſcheme of giving an *unlimited toleration* to every *Public Teacher*, to preach and propagate whatever doctrines they ſhall pleaſe to call *Scripture-doctrine*, is inconſiſtent with all *order and government*, ſubverſive of all *eſtabliſhments*, muſt introduce *confuſion* into the *Church*, and corrupt the purity of the *Chriſtian faith*.

THAT there ſhould be ſome examination and inquiry into the *faith* of the *Candidates for the Miniſtry*, is agreed on both ſides.

THAT theſe cannot, in the preſent ſtate of things, be made to any ſufficient purpoſe, by the uſe of the *mere words of Scripture only*—that, therefore, if an inquiry be made to any *ſufficient purpoſe*, it muſt be *explanatory*—that, the *affixing the ſenſe of Scripture*, muſt, in this caſe, be left, in the nature of things, to thoſe whoſe office and duty it is to admit to, or reject from, the miniſtry; not to every ſingle perſon, *as ſuch*; but to the *united Council* and determination of the *Church*; who may form, according to the beſt of their judgment and conſcience, a *ſtandard* for that purpoſe—Theſe points have, I hope, been made clearly evident to the reaſon of all unprejudiced perſons, in the courſe of this debate.

I AM, nevertheleſs, as much an advocate for *Chriſtian liberty*, for *freedom of thought and inquiry*, as

as any other can reaſonably be; and would oppoſe, as much as lies in my power, any *attacks* or *incroachments* upon them.—I have no attachment to any *particular number* of Articles—I have no veneration for the number *thirty-nine*; nor do I think there is any ſpell, or faſcination in it—A *review* of our *preſent Articles*, by learned and judicious perſons, properly-appointed, I have no objection to. If the ſenſe of the Articles were diſtinctly determined, and the truth of them freely examined; and if, in doctrines (if there ſhould appear to be any ſuch) which cannot be clearly proved to be either *fundamental*, *eſſential*, or *neceſſary*; or, where the truth ſhall appear to be *dubious*, or cannot clearly be *decided*; it were propoſed to leave, avowedly, a *greater latitude* for *difference of opinions*; with ſuch *farther regulations* concerning the *nature of* the *ſubſcription*, as to the learning, judgment and charity of the Governors of the Church ſhall appear wiſe and reaſonable; I ſhould be far from any oppoſition to ſuch a ſcheme.

But, as to *explanatory* articles, or an *explanatory* inquiry, *in the general*; I am ſeriouſly and ſincerely perſuaded, that ſuch an *explanatory teſt* of the qualifications of the Candidates for the Miniſtry, in the fundamental, eſſential, and neceſſary points of faith; is abſolutely and indiſpenſably neceſſary, to the peace, union, and order of the Church; and to the preſervation of the unity, and purity of the Chriſtian Religion.

I have thus gone through, what I undertook, a *full and particular reply* to Mr. *Chandler's Caſe of Subſcription*; ſo far as any thing has been advanced therein, in anſwer to the *Church of England vindicated*—with what ſucceſs, I ſhall leave to the determination of the *impartial* and *judicious* reader—As Mr. *Chandler* has thought proper to enter

enter into the controverſy, in defence of the *Old Whig*; and has taken upon him to uſe me with *very great freedom*; he muſt excuſe me, if, in vindication of myſelf, I have treated his arguments and exceptions, as *they*, and the *ſtile and manner* of his performance, deſerved.

F I N I S.

12 MR 58

ERRATA.

PAGE 26. line 28. *After* Church Governors—*add*—to make an explanatory Inquiry, or,
P. 36. l. 21. *For*—them *r.* him
P. 52. l. *last*, and P. 53. l. 1. *Dele*—them
P. 57. l. 22. *Dele*—them
P. 62. l. 5. *r.* injoined
P. 72. l. 35. *r.* genuin
P. 174. l. 35. *For* found *r.* found.

BOOKS printed for W. INNYS *in* Pater-noſter-Row.

1. THE Church of *England* vindicated, in requiring Subſcription from the Clergy to the XXXIX Articles of Religion: in Remarks on ſome Weekly Papers; entitled, The Old Whig, or, Conſiſtent Proteſtant, 8vo.

2. A View of the Controverſy, concerning the Miraculous Powers which are ſuppoſed to have ſubſiſted in the Chriſtian Church, from the earlieſt Ages, through ſeveral ſucceſſive Centuries; as it ſtands, between the Introductory Diſcourſe, to a larger Work deſigned hereafter to be publiſhed; and, Obſervations on the Introductory Diſcourſe. With occaſional Remarks on other Writers in this Controverſy, and a Poſtſcript, occaſioned by Mr. *Brooke's Defenſio Miraculorum*, &c. 8vo.

12 MR 58